



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—*Memoir on two large Medallion Busts which are preserved in the Manuscript Room of the Library of Trinity College, Dublin ; as also on two inedited Patmian Inscriptions extracted from the Collection formed by the Author during his Travels through Anatolia and the neighbouring Islands of the Archipelago, in the Years 1840 and 1841.* By JAMES KENNEDY BAILIE, D. D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, and Lecturer of Greek in the University.

Read June 12th and 26th, 1851.

SECTION I.

A PECULIAR interest attaches itself, at least in the eyes of the writer of this Memoir, to the first-mentioned of these monuments of antiquity, which mainly has induced him to submit to the Academy certain results of his study of them, partly in a philological point of view, but not less prominently as specimens of Grecian art, elaborated after a primitive and most remarkable type. I particularize the first of these, as the sculptures before us were accompanied by epigraphs explanatory of their subjects; and, in the instance of one, commemorative of the site whence, doubtless, it had been originally procured. I propose, therefore, to arrange my observations under the following heads: firstly, as I have already intimated, the philological, comprising exegetical and critical remarks on these inscriptions, one of which has reached us in a state of absolute preservation; whilst the other, I regret to mention, demands the aid of the student versed in such inquiries, to attempt its restoration to an integral form. This has resulted from the disappearance of rather more than one-half of each of its component lines, in consequence of injuries sustained by it at distinct periods.

Of these mutilations, a certain amount was, perhaps, intentional; whilst others may be presumed to have been the result of carelessness during the pe-

riod of the transit of the marble over sea to its present destination. Fortunately, however, a moiety of the epigraph of no inconsiderable interest has been left intact, adding one more notice to the very few which we had already possessed of the city for which it was originally designed ; and acquainting us, in all likelihood, with the name of the donor.

My second head of inquiry I may term the archæological, as in it I mean to investigate the type or fashion according to which these sculptures have been elaborated. In prosecuting this into its details, I hope to be enabled to demonstrate that it confers upon them a high intrinsic value, as it seems, if I mistake not, to identify them with a class of anaglyphs, of which few or no specimens have reached our time. Here, however, I wish myself to be understood as speaking of sculptures alone, and excluding from consideration all such reliefs as have been wrought in metals after the same type ; for of these I believe that a considerable number are extant.

Such is a very general outline of a rather embarrassing subject, in one section of which, from casualties which cannot now be redressed, I have been compelled to deal largely with probabilities. These words will be better understood hereafter. In the mean time, my entrance into these investigations must be preceded by one remark, which is, that I esteem it but as due to one of our most distinguished associates, and this not merely by his position in our society, but also by his zealous co-operation in every effort to advance the interests of sound learning, to apprise the Members of the Academy, that I but follow in his footsteps. This gentleman, and I feel pleasure in adding, my valued friend, was the first member of the University on record to direct attention to these memorials of classic art, and to disinter them from the obscurity in which they had but too long lain. It was at a meeting of this Society on January 25, 1841, that Dr. TODD, then one of our Vice-Presidents, laid before it all that was known of their history,* citing at the same time certain critical and topographical notices respecting one of them in particular by the venerable Chaplain of the British Embassy at Constantinople during the latter part of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries ; and accompanying these services with fac-similes of the tituli to which I have referred. These facts I know

* Vide "Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy," vol. II. n. 27, pp. 49, ss.

not how to mention without experiencing somewhat of a feeling of contrition for my own supineness during a period when the care of these Keimélia had been intrusted to myself ; an error against taste which I can only extenuate by pleading as its cause the almost Cimmerian darkness to which they have been so long consigned, but from which I cherish the hope that awakened regards and academic feeling will ere long interpose to rescue them. I derive, moreover, some degree of consolation from the reflection, that at the very period to which I have adverted, when these monuments were brought before the notice of the Academy, I was engaged in traversing the region which we may term their birth-place, and thus charging my mind with associations which were the fittest preparatives towards my atoning for my former neglect. I have accordingly undertaken my present most agreeable office ; one not the less so, because it has been engaged in not merely with the permission, but at the express suggestion, of my learned friend ; and have selected the present occasion, the earliest which I could command, to submit to my fellow-academicians, the results of my study of these epigraphs.

I commence with that which has escaped the injuries of time and barbarism, and proceeds as follows :

ΚΛ. ΛΥΣΙΜΑΧΗΝ ΤΗΝ ΦΙΛΑΝΔΡΟΝ
ΟΘΡΕΨΑΣ ΘΗΛΥΜΙΤΡΗΣ

Κλ. Λυσιμάχην, τὴν φίλανδρον,
ὁ θρέψας Θηλυμίτρης,

that is, “ Thelymítres, who had been her nurturer, has erected this bust in honour of Claudia Lysimáche, the distinguished for her conjugal affection.”

The first remark which suggests itself here is the apparent incompleteness of the construction, the verb of which *Θηλυμίτρης* is the subjective case not being expressed. This is undoubtedly **ΕΤΙΜΗΕ**, or, as it would have been written, in accordance with the almost invariable orthography of the Græco-Roman period, had it been introduced at all, **ΕΤΕΙΜΗΕ**. In tituli, however, of this class, such especially as that now before us, the ellipsis of the verb was accounted rather an elegance of diction than the reverse, as may be abundantly proved. Thus, in a Trallian inscription published in my second volume of

Greek and Græco-Roman tituli,* we read, **Ο . ΔΗΜΟΣ . ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΝ . ΟΥΛΙΑΔΟΥ . ΤΟΥ . ΕΥΘΥΔΗΜΟΥ . ΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΗΝ . ΤΗΣ . ΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΞ . ΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΩΝ . ΓΕΓΟΝΟΤΑ**, that is, *ἐτίμησε*, "hath paid this tribute of honour to Ménandros, son of Uliádes, etc.," the author meaning thereby the erection of a small fluted column, in the upper part of which a smooth surface had been left, to serve as a tablet for receiving the epigraph.

Another from the Karian site, Aphrodisiás,† proceeds as follows: **Η . ΠΑΤΡΙΣ . ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΝ . ΚΑ . ΑΥΡΗΛΙΟΝ . ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΥ . ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΥ . ΚΑΠΕΤΩΛΕΙΝΟΥ . ΥΟΝ . ΚΤΗΣΙΑΝ . ΤΟΝ . ΡΗΤΟΡΑ**. Here the honour most probably consisted in the erection of a statue, of the pedestal of which the marble that bore the inscription may have been a fragment.

It is unnecessary to multiply examples of this omission, which, from its repeated occurrence, seems entitled to rank amongst rules of general acceptance. Cases, it is true, of the verb being introduced, occur even in concise tituli, as in the second of the inscriptions which I have published from the marbles of Vûdrûm,‡ the representative of Halikarnassós, commencing with **Ο . ΔΗΜΟΣ . ΕΤΕΙΜΗΣΕΝ**; but such will be found, on sufficient examination, to be so restricted in number as to merge in the class of exceptions. It will be observed, therefore, in a subsequent part of this Memoir, that I have adopted the canon now enunciated when effecting my restoration of the mutilated epigraph, to the case of which either of two verbs, of constant use in honorary or votive inscriptions, is appropriate. I here mean *ἀνέθηκε* and *ἀνέστησε*, and refer to occasions when statues, busts, hermæ, or anaglyphs, are mentioned as having been erected in certain places, or presented to certain colleges or communities. The rule most generally adopted in such instances, was to express the image of the personage, whether divine or human, by his or her proper name, and carry on the construction by either introducing or implying one of these verbs.

My next observation on this epigraph regards the lineole which we remark at the outset in a nearly central position above **ΚΑ**. That this formed the base of an O-méga engraved in the peculiar introverted form which is of such

* Fascic. Inscriptt. Græc. II. p. 80. n. CVI. b. Comp. p. 163. n. CLXXIX. g.

† Ibid. p. 31. n. LVII. p. Comp. F. III. CCCXII. a. CCCXIV. c. Böckh, Corp. Inscr. n. 619. n. 3004.

‡ Fascic. II. p. 70. n. XCIII. b.

frequent occurrence in the tituli of the Græco-Roman era, the upper member whereof has disappeared by attrition of the marble, might seem to have been the opinion of SMITH,* who, in his letter to Primate MARSH, reads the name for which $\overline{\text{KA}}$ stands, "Clodia;" for otherwise we must suppose him to have been ignorant of the fact, that these letters, taken by themselves, represent "Claudia" in all tituli wherein they occur. It is true, that in point of fact, the difference between these gentilicial names was more apparent than real;† but yet, as a question of reading, it becomes a matter of importance to determine which is the most entitled to acceptance, and I unhesitatingly decide in favour of the latter. The surface of the stéle presents no indications of any erasure having taken place; and most certainly the lineole, in itself, could have exerted no such power as to convert "Claudia" into "Clodia." But there are two other influences which it may have exercised, and of these I proceed to select the one most appropriate to its present position.

It is certain, that in tituli of the Græco-Roman period, such horizontal lineoles marked the transition of the letters over which they were incised, from being alphabetic signs to becoming the exponents of numerals. One instance of many may be cited as demonstrative of this, selected from a very remarkable epigraph which I copied when in Pérgamos,‡ from a pedestal that once had supported a statue of Hadrian, namely, the clause which supplies the date of

* Vide Proceedings R. I. A. ut supr., p. 50. † Vide Eckhel, Doctr. Num. Vet. T. v. p. 170. a.

‡ Fascic. I. p. 83. n. XIX. a. ll. 6. s. I may be allowed here to offer a remark as to the value of this inscription, which first appeared in my collection of tituli from the sites of the Apocalyptic Churches. This consists in its precise notice of the Tribunate of Hadrian, the general absence of which from the coins of that Augustus, and other monuments relating to him, has contributed to much uncertainty in the chronology of his reign. Thus Eckhel has remarked, in his Doctr. Num. Vet. vol. VI. p. 481, a. under V. C. 877. P. X. 124. "In Asiam creditur (i. e. Hadrianus) transivisse, et invisisse ejus provincias." The "belief" expressed here amounts nearly to certainty with the evidence of this inscription before us: for we may reasonably assume, that the occasion of Hadrian's presence amongst the Pergamenes was that of the dedication of the statue, from the pedestal of which I copied the inscription, that is, during his seventh tribunate. Now, as the "dies natalis" of his reign was, as Spartianus informs us, the III. Id. August. U. C. 870., and as his tribunitial power was renewed on that day in each subsequent year, it follows that in the year U. C. 877. he concluded his seventh and entered upon his eighth tribunate; therefore, that the earlier part of his year was passed in visiting the eastern provinces of the empire. See Eckhel's chapter "De Tribunitia Potestate" in vol. VIII. pp. 413. s.

inauguration, the seventh tribuneship and third consulate of the Emperor, in the original, ΔΗΜΑΡΧΙΚΗΣ . ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑΣ . ΤΟ . Ζ . ΥΠΑΤΟΝ . ΤΟ . Γ . Nothing, however, can be more evident than that the application of this principle of notation to the case before us is wholly out of the question, so that we are forced to adopt the only alternative which remains, that this lineole was intended to serve as a *σύνδεσμος*, or Band, and thus express the combination of the two letters over which it was engraved in one name, ΚΛΑΥΔΙΑ, the real gentilicium of the female mentioned in the epigraph. In the absence of this precaution, the mistake of assigning her to an entirely different Gens, for example, the Cornelian, might have occurred, and then of reading the lambda so as to tally therewith; for example, ΛΟΥΠΑ. I say, "might have occurred," but with such an array of chances against it, that I cannot but regard the introduction of this band, if such it really were, as an expedient wholly superfluous: and in the same light I view the rather unsightly indentation which appears to the right of the letters we have been considering, and before the Greek name, with the evident intention of keeping each distinct from the other. The eye must have been unpractised indeed to which the absence of such guides could have occasioned any perplexity. In point of fact, their introduction has been the cause of error, one having, as we have seen, led to a mistake in the reading of the Roman name, and the other, the separating mark, having caused the editors of Gudius' Inscriptions, by its remote similarity to the common form of the sigma, to attach it in the shape of that letter to the first two of the epigraph, thus marring a transcript which otherwise would have been faultless.* It is, however, to be borne in mind, that these are mistakes which no Greek, or well-informed copyist of modern times, could ever have committed. But haste in the first instance has too often degenerated into negligence in the second, and this in its turn ends in the perversion of a third, of which examples without number occur in epigraphic literature, to exercise the sagacity and test the learning of the editors of these ancient records.

I now proceed to offer some remarks on the actual terms of this inscription, namely, the epithet *φιλανδρον*, which terminates the first line, and the participle *θρέψας*, which commences the second. The first of these solicits our attention,

* Vide Proceedings R. I. A. ut supr., p. 50.

and in no less a degree the proper name "Thelymítres," were it only for the subdued feeling of uneasiness which the venerable commentator, from whom Dr. Todd has cited so largely, betrays respecting them.* His recorded doubts and perplexities, more especially in the instance of the latter, have occasioned me not a little amusement; and the rather, because, to confess the truth, they appear on the face of the monument in a somewhat questionable juxtaposition for the posthumous reputation of both parties, the nurturer as well as the nurtured, as I hope, but with no sinister intent, to make apparent.

Let us first devote a few moments to the name, as the most remarkable and of very rare occurrence, but with this general observation premised, that were proper names or appellatives adopted as criteria of the moral characters of persons of either sex, the result might prove any thing but auspicious to many worthy individuals whose memories have been preserved in the archives of antiquity. We might then presume, to cite an instance, that the benevolent Prefect, whom the gratitude of a Karian city† has immortalized on one of its yet remaining portals, was the slave of the gross passion which his leading name expresses; or that persons so unfortunate in their cognomina, as was the colleague of Scipio Nasica in the consulship,‡ were outcasts from humanity. But, in a graver point of view, the name with which we deal at present appears in itself to merit some attention. It bears the impress of having been in some way connected with the Dionysiac mysteries, and was, perhaps, on this ground, that is, from some sacerdotal connexion with the worship of *Diónysos*, introduced at first into the family of the erector of this anaglyph. Its import as an appellative has indeed been stated by SMITH with sufficient correctness, as appears from the expressions which Lucian has attributed to *Zeús* in answer to his consort's disparaging notice of his son; § *Καὶ μὲν οὗτός γε ὁ θηλυμίτρης, ὁ ἀβρότερος τῶν γυναικῶν, οὐ μόνον, ᾧ Ἡρα, τὴν Λυδίαν ἐχειρώσατο κ. τ. λ.* He does not attempt to gainsay the most prominent of *Hera's* charges against *Diónysos*, his assumption of the feminine head-dress, which she insists upon as a sin against decorum, but contents himself with palliating it by setting it in contrast to his valorous achievements. Thus again, in another part of his writings,|| the

* Vide Proceedings R. I. A. ut supr., pp. 50. a.

† Viz. *Aphrodisiás*. See Fascic. II. p. 17. n. XLVI. c. 7.

‡ Vide Flor. III. 1. 7.

§ Dial. Deor. XVIII. 1.

|| Bacch. 3.

Indians are represented as expressing their unmeasured scorn of their invader, by styling him *θηλυμίτην ἄρχοντα*.^{*} We are not, therefore, in the case before us, to view the epithet abstractedly, as SMITH has done; but in the particular connexion sanctioned by these passages of Lucian, and then as merging into a proper, and it may be, an inherited name, implying a sacerdotal relation, and by consequence, a high social position. That this was, in all probability, the case, will perhaps appear more evident when I proceed to treat of the site from which the sculptures before us were originally procured, as I hope to identify it, and advance sufficient reasons for presuming its addiction to the Dionysiac worship.

I come now to the epithet *Φίλανδρος*. That this was a word of equivocal import there can be no doubt, with the testimony of Plato† before us : *Φιλογύναικές τε εἰσὶ, καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν μοιχῶν ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γένους γέγονασιν καὶ ὄσαι αἱ γυναῖκες φίλανδροί τε καὶ μοιχεύτριαι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γένους γίγνονται*, that is, from the Androgynous race, of which Aristophanes is introduced as giving so imaginative a description. Here there can be no question as to the meaning of our epithet, and of its fully accounting for SMITH's misgivings in its present juxtaposition.

Let us see, however, whether we cannot redress the balance in favour of our Alumna. I find the abstract, *φιλανδρία*, in a Gortynian titulus first published by Pococke, and recently in a restored form by Böckh : † **ΑΣΙΑΤΙΚΗΝ . ΒΑΛΕΡΙΟΥ . ΑΣΙΑΤΙΚΟΥ . ΓΥΝΑΙΚΑ . κ.τ.λ. ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗΣ . ΕΝΕΚΑ . ΚΑΙ . ΦΙΛΑΝΔΡΙΑΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΛΟΙΠΗΣ . ΑΡΕΤΗΣ**. Here there can be as little doubt of its purer import; of its expressing *conjugal attachment*, just as *φιλοτεκνία* in the Lyttian titulus which goes before does *maternal*. It enters, accordingly, as an element into the moral character of Asiatica, in consideration of

* It is to this epithet that Virgil alludes in the contemptuous words which he attributes to Iarbas when speaking of Æneas and his followers; *Æn. iv. 215. ss.* "Et nunc ille Paris cum semi-viro comitatu, Mæonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem Subnexus rapto potitur." A combatant, in like manner, taunts them in *Æneid. ix. 616.* "Et tunicæ manicas, et habent redimicula mitræ."

The classical student may consult on this appellative Lobeck. ad Phrynich. Eclog. p. 628. and Creuzer. Melet. Crit. P. I. 21.

† Sympos. vol. x. p. 191. d. e. Bipont.

‡ Corp. Inscr. vol. II. p. 429. n. 2587. Pococke, Inscr. Ant. P. I. p. 43. n. 1.

which she had been adjudged the honour of a statue by the Gortynian authorities. Still more germane to our purpose is the titulus of a Parian monument published by Böckh,* from ΣΡΟΝ and others, which states that the most illustrious city of the Parians had erected a statue in honour of Aurelia Leïta, as “a lover of wisdom,” and “eminent for her conjugal, maternal, and patriotic virtues;” expressed in the original, ΤΗΝ . ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΦΙΛΑΝΔΡΟΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΦΙΛΟΠΑΙΔΑ . ΚΑΙ . ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΡΙΝ.

My zeal in my present cause, and my anxiety to remove from this monument the least semblance of objectionable import, have led to my dwelling somewhat longer on these explanations than the actual necessity of the case might seem to require. I have felt myself, however, constrained to produce these authorities by the remarks of my venerable predecessor in this inquiry, which tend, indirectly at least, to excite suspicions respecting it, not very complimentary to its character. Yet the very reverse is the fact: for it stands before us a record of virtue, and of the estimation in which that attribute was held by one who, from the position which he occupied, was best qualified to appreciate its excellence. This position has been announced in the word which immediately precedes his name, *θρέψας*, on which I have proposed some observations.

The details into which I am now about to enter possess a high degree of interest, as *θρέψας* occurring in this connexion expresses a relationship of a very close and obligatory character known to have subsisted amongst the ancient Greeks, indeed, even at the present day, not quite obsolete amongst the race which claims them as progenitors. The correlative terms which denoted this connexion, were, on the one side, *θρεπτήρ*, *θρέπτειρα*, or, in accordance with the epigraph before us, *θρέψας*, *θρέψασα*; on the other, *θρεπτός*, *θρεπτή*, whence the plural form *θρεπτά*, together with the more comprehensive *θρέμμα*, and its diminutive *θρεμμάτιον*. The Attic forms were different,† but we are at present concerned with those alone which prevailed in Asiatic Greece, in accordance with the dialect of which *θρεπτήρια*, or *θρέπτρα*, expressed the offices which were due by the latter to the former, the nurtured to the nurturer.

Very frequent allusions to all these occur in inscriptions, from which source

* Corp. etc. II. p. 346. n. 2384.

VOL. XXII.

† Viz. *τροφεύς*, *τρόφιμος*, *τροφέϊον*, κ. τ. λ.

N

I now proceed to cite a few examples, chiefly selected from those which I have myself transcribed.

In one from the Karian city Aphrodisiás, which I have published in my second volume,* we observe, as in that now before us, the participle replacing the noun substantive: **ΑΦΡΟΔΕΙΤΗ . ΘΕΟΙΣ . ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΙΣ . ΤΟ . . . ΕΙ . ΝΥΚΑΙ . ΤΑ . ΑΝΑΛΗΜΜΑΤΑ . ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ . ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ . ΜΟΛΟΣΣΟΣ . κ . τ . λ . ΕΡΓΕΠΙΣΤΑΤΗΣΑΝΤΟΣ . ΕΡΜΑ . ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ . ΤΟΥ . ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ . ΚΑΤΑ . ΤΑΣ . ΜΟΛΟΣΣΟΥ . ΤΟΥ . ΘΡΕΨΑΝΤΟΣ . ΑΥΤΟΥ . ΔΙΑΘΗΚΑΣ .** Here the natural relationship between uncle and nephew seems to have been merged in the ascititious one between the nurturer and the nurtured, this appearing on the face of the epigraph to have been primarily the cause of the designation of Hermâs by the testator Molossós, as the trustee of an important bequest to his fellow-citizens. Again, in a Philadelphian titulus† published in the same volume, we read as follows: **ΤΙΒ . [ΚΛ] . Μ[ΑΝΕΙΛΙΟΣ] . ΙΕΡΕΥΣ . ΤΗΣ . [ΘΕΙΟ]ΤΑΤΗΣ . ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΟΣ . ΤΗΝ . ΣΩΦΡΟΝ[ΕΣ]ΤΑΤΗΝ . ΓΥΝΑΙΚΑ . [ΚΑ]ΤΑ . ΤΑ . ΔΟΞΑΝΤΑ . ΤΗ . ΒΟΥΛΗ . ΠΡΟΝΟΗΣΑΜΕΝΟΥ . ΤΗΣ . ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΕΩΣ . ΤΙΒ . ΚΛ . ΘΑΛΛΟΥ . ΤΟΥ . ΙΔΙΟΥ . ΑΥΤΗΣ . ΘΡΕΠΤΟΥ .** Here we are informed of the Alumnus (*θρεπτός*) having been associated with the nearest surviving relative of the female to whom he had owed his nurture, his *θρέπτειρα*, in paying a very high tribute of honour and affection to her memory. Reciprocally, we observe in many tituli distinct mention introduced of kind offices on the part of nurturers towards those who in their tender years had experienced the benefits of their guardianship. Thus, in an Antiphellian inscription,‡ published in my third volume, we read of a certain Euélthon having constructed a sepulchral monument for his own use and that of the immediate members of his family, and accompanying these details with the usual interdict against the intrusion of all other parties whomsoever; but with a special proviso in favour of those whose nurture he had undertaken, his *θρεπτά*, to whom he assigns a distinct compartment in the structure, termed the Hyposóron. The words in the original relative to this are, **[ΕΝ . ΔΕ]ΤΩ . ΥΠΟΣΟ[ΡΙ]Ω . [ΕΝΚΗΔΕΥΘΗΣΟΝΤΑΙ] . ΚΑΙ . ΤΑ . ΘΡΕΠΤΑ . ΜΟΥ .** In

* Fascic. II. p. 39. n. LXVI. γ.

† Ibid. p. 163. n. CLXXIX. g.

‡ Fascic. III. p. 33. n. CCLXX. e.

another inscription* from the same site, we find a certain Eútychos erecting a similar monument, and introducing restrictions as to its usufruct in words nearly identical with the foregoing. The clause which saves the rights of his Alumni appears thus: **ΙΣ . ΔΕ . ΥΠΟΣ[ΟΡ]ΙΟΝ . ΕΝΚΗΔΕΥΘΗΣΟΝΤΑΙ . ΤΑ . ΘΡΕΠΤΑΡΙΑ . ΜΟΥ.** Farther on in the same volume, a Kyanean titulus† informs us that a lady named Melitiané had engaged in a like undertaking, and then reserved the right of sepulture therein to her Alumna Nánna, co-ordinately with herself, her husband, her daughter, son-in-law, and grandchildren: **ΕΑΥΤΗ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΝΔΡΙ . ΑΥΤΗΣ . ΕΡΜΑΠΙΑ . ΕΥΔΟΞΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΓΑΜΒΡΩ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΚΓΟΝΟΙΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΘΡΕΠΤΗ . ΝΑΝΝΗ.**

I conclude my extracts under this head with a Halikarnassian titulus of the same class, which has been published from ΔΙΔΟΤ and others by the learned Böckh,‡ but in a form with which he expresses himself as not altogether satisfied: **ΤΟ . ΜΝΗΜΕΙΟΝ . ΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥΑΣΑΝ . ΕΡΜΗΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΘΕΟΔΟΤΗ . ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ . ΜΗ . ΕΞΕΣΤΩ . ΔΕ . ΕΤΕΡΟΝ . ΤΕΘΗΝΑΙ . ΜΗΔΕΝΑ . ΕΙ . ΜΗ . ΕΡΜΗΝ . ΠΑΠΑΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΘΕΟΔΟΤΗΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΡΜΗΝ . [ΚΑΙ] . ΤΟ . ΟΝΟΜΑ . ΤΟ . ΕΡΜΗΔΟΣ . ΘΡΕΠΤΟΝ . ΑΥΤΩΝ.** Hermês, the Alumnus of the proprietors of this monument, appears thus to have been placed in the same rank with themselves and their nearest relatives, as to the right of sepulture therein. Now, when we take into consideration the undoubted fact, that no rights or privileges were more jealously guarded than those to the usufruct of a family sepulchre, that the provisions respecting it were duly registered in the proper office in each city, that the aid of the civil power was thus invoked to guarantee its integrity, by the denouncement of pains and penalties against such as intruded into, or violated, it; nay, that special formulæ of malediction, and devotement to the vengeance of the deities of the lower world, were contrived, to arrest the arm of sacrilege when raised to desecrate these sanctuaries of the dead, we are in a condition to estimate the favour which was conferred by such concessions as the foregoing, and consequently the amount of claim which the Alumnus was thought to possess.

Scarcely less demonstrative of the affection which bound these parties together, were the tributes of respect of which we read as occasionally rendered

* Fascic. III. p. 28. n. CCLXVII. b.

† Ibid. p. 49. n. CCLXXXIII. c.

‡ Corp. Inscr. II. p. 457. n. 2664.

to the nurtured, after their decease, by the guardians of their infancy. These sometimes involved a liberal expenditure, as in the instance of the anaglyph before us, which was unquestionably a posthumous honour; but more especially so, when they were decreed by the municipal authorities of a city, and executed at their private cost by the parties who had sustained that relation towards the deceased; for we may be assured that, under such auspices, no expense would be spared which was necessary to secure the co-operation of high art and consummate ability.

A striking instance of this is afforded by an inscription of Thyáteira, which Böckh has published* from the transcripts of SPON, SMITH, and others, wherein it is recorded that a female of high rank, Ulpia Marcella, had the honour of a statue decreed to her by the suffrages of the senate and people of that city, the cost having been undertaken by those who had brought her up, namely, Andrónikos and Stratoníke. It proceeds thus : ΑΓΑΘΗ . ΤΥΧΗ . Η . ΒΟΥΛΗ . ΚΑΙ . Ο . ΔΗΜΟΣ . ΕΤΕΙΜΗΣΑΝ . ΟΥΛΠΙΑΝ . ΜΑΡΚΕΛΛΑΝ . Κ. Τ. Λ. ΑΝΑΣΤΗΣΑΝΤΩΝ . ΤΗΝ . ΤΕΙΜΗΝ . ΑΝΔΡΟΝΕΙΚΟΥ . ΤΟΥ . ΑΝΔΡΟΝΕΙΚΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΕΙΚΗΣ . ΤΗΣ . ΜΗΝΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ . ΤΩΝ . ΘΡΕΨΑΝΤΩΝ . ΕΚ . ΤΩΝ . ΙΔΙΩΝ. This casts into the shade even the liberality of our Thelymitres : but not so the following, copied from a marble† fragment which had been built into one of the walls of a Turkish house in Gheyerah, the representative of the ancient Aphrodisiás. This block had probably formed part of a cippus, from which description of sepulchral monument I have transcribed some highly interesting tituli on the same ground, and which had been, like numberless others, so wrought into building material as to preserve the epigraph unmutated. This I mention with the view of palliating the offence which in innumerable instances has been committed against good taste . . . even by Greeks themselves . . . in employing these records of ancient civilization for what we must regard as sordid and unworthy purposes ; and so dismiss a theme on which I might feel tempted to be unseasonably eloquent, to pursue my more immediate subject.

The inscription to which I have alluded harmonized well in its simple and unpretending beauty with the inornate marble on which it had been engraved : ΠΕΤΡΩΝΙΟΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΠΦΙΟΝ . ΕΩΤΗΡΙΔΟΣ . ΤΟΥ . ΘΡΕΜΜΑΤΙΟΥ . ΜΝΕΙΑΣ .

* Corp. Inscr. II. p. 838. n. 3507.

† Ibid. p. 492. n. 2733.

XAPIN, that is, "Petronius and Appium (have erected this, *τοῦτο ἀνέστησαν*), to preserve the memory of their nursling Soteris." I regard the diminutive here used as the exponent of the sentiments of the survivors, just as *παῖδιον* and *θυγάτριον* might have been in the corresponding natural relation, and have accordingly rendered it by the word in our language which appears to be its nearest synonym; as is the German "Pflegekind."

From these and numerous other citations which might be adduced, the inference is abundantly clear, that the bond which united the nurturer and the nurtured became in most cases equivalent to one of consanguinity, and that the duties which, in consequence, the latter owed to the former were of proportionally stringent obligation, were in effect filial. Honour, obedience, and should the exigence of the case demand it, provision in declining years, were the duties of the Alumnus. These were, as I have already mentioned, comprehended by the Greeks under the term *θρεπτήρια*, which the accurate Passow explains* as though contemplating merely the relation between parent and child; "Der Dank oder der Unterhalt den die Kinder als Lohn der in der Jugend empfangenen Pflege und Erziehung den alternden Ältern angedeihn liessen." But, as we have seen, the language of inscriptions widens their application by revealing to us more of the inner life of ancient Greek society. From these we learn that, exclusively of the *τέκνα γνήσια*, or as they are sometimes denominated in tituli, *φυσικά*, as also of the *θετά*,† or *καθ' υιοθεσίαν*, whose rights were strictly defined by law, there were also the *τρόφιμα* or *θρεπτά*, the claims possessed by whom were not the less to be respected because left in a great measure to the influence of those sentiments, to which they originally owed their being, for their recognition. Certain, however, it is, that the charities of domestic life which grow out of natural relationships take such forcible possession of the mind, that we cease to be surprised at their absorbing the poet's contemplation to the exclusion of kindred emotions of a purely conventional origin.

Amongst these, Homer‡ leads the way, who on more than one occasion

* "Handwört. d. Gr. Spr." B. I. p. 1074. b.

† Heródot. VI. 57. *Καὶ ἦν τις θετὸν παῖδα ποιέσθαι ἐθέλη κ. τ. λ.*

‡ Iliad δ'. 477. ss. ρ'. 301. ss. Homer, however, is not destitute of express reference to this

accounts it the saddest consequence of a warrior's premature death, that he has thus been prevented from making the wonted return (*θρέπτρα*) to the authors of his being for the assiduity and solicitude with which they had watched over his infancy: and Hesiod, when enumerating the characters of his iron age, reckons it as one of the worst that men would then refuse their aged parents the filial offices (*θρεπτήρια*) due to them.* Apollónios† comes next in order, who, in a passage of great power and beauty, introduces Alkiméde addressing her son on the eve of his embarkation with his fellow Argonáutai in a paroxysm of grief, and reminding him of the zeal with which he had reciprocated her maternal care; that he had repaid her with every filial office but one, and that that one, the celebration of her obsequies, should have devolved upon him the moment when the mandate of Pelías pronounced his doom:

Αἴθ' ὄφελον κείν' ἡμαρ, ὅτ' ἐξεκόντος ἄκουσα
 Δειλὴ ἐγὼ Πελῖαο κακὴν βασιλῆος ἐφετμὴν,
 Αὐτίκ' ἀπὸ ψυχὴν μεθέμεν, κηδέων τε λαθέσθαι,
 *Ὅφρ' αὐτός με τεῆσι φίλαις ταρχύσας χερσὶ,
 Τέκνον ἐμόν· τὸ γὰρ οἶον ἔην ἔτι λοιπὸν ἐέλδωρ
 Ἐκ σέθεν, ἄλλα δὲ πάντα πάλαι θρεπτήρια πέσσω.

The same *θρεπτήρια* is also the word which Sophoklēs‡ makes Polyneíkes use at the sight of his sire's abject condition, thus conducting the thought beyond the mere physical aliment to a view more elevated and congenial. Eurípides, on the other hand, replaces it with an expression which we may term a poetical exegesis of its sense in that scene of surpassing interest and feeling in his "Iphigéneia in Aulís,"§ where the devoted princess pleads for the reversal of her sire's unnatural sentence by her love for the light of this upper world, and her horror of visiting the realms of darkness; by recapitulating the fond hopes to which he had given expression amidst the mutual endearments of her infancy, in the prospect he cherished of her happiness and

secondary affinity: of which we possess an illustrious example in the words which he attributes to the shade of Pátroklos in *Iliad* ψ'. 82. ss.

* *Oper. et DD.* vv. 185. s.

† *Argonaut. A'*. 278–83.

‡ *Œdip. Colon.* 1263.

§ *Iph. in Aulid.* 1218–30.

her union to a worthy suitor; and then picturing the contrast which will result from his persisting in his inhuman resolve :

Τί δ' ἄρ' ἐγὼ σε πρέσβυν; ἄρ' εἰσδέξομαι
Ἑμῶν φίλαισιν ὑποδοχαῖς δόμων, πατέρ,
Πόνων τιθηνούς ἀποδιδούσά σοι τροφάς;

These references combined supply us with a vivid representation of the sense entertained by the ancient Greeks of the obligatory character of the duties of which we treat in the primary relations of life; and we possess, as I have endeavoured to demonstrate from their family monuments, clear evidence of its having been the same in kind, if not in degree, in cases, wherein the sole bond which existed was the supplying and receiving nurture. The origin of this sentiment, so prevalent and so wrought into the frame-work of society, unquestionably was, that the office undertaken by such persons as Thelymítres in the titulus before us, involved not merely the supplying of Aliment to their charges, but also of Institution, termed by the Greeks Παιδεία. In this sense we are to understand Xenophôn,* when he states concerning the hero of his historical romance, Κῦρος δὲ κατέμενε, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐτρέφετο, the last of these words being explained a little farther on;† Καὶ ἦν μὲν ἴσως ὁ Κῦρος πολυλογώτερος, ἅμα μὲν διὰ τὴν παιδείαν κ. τ. λ. Herodian‡ also attaches the same meaning to this verb when assigning the reason of Commodus having been at the outset of his career so popular with the Romans; Ἐπόθουν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀληθεῖ ψυχῆς διαθέσει ἅτε παρ' αὐτοῖς γεννηθέντα τε καὶ τραφέντα. Still more apposite to our purpose in the choice of expressions is the apostolical precept which is addressed to the fathers of families;§ Μὴ παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοουθεσίᾳ Κυρίου. Here the use of the composite verb can furnish no ground of objection, for the only effect of the preposition can be to add to, not detract from, the force of the signification, just as in the parallel cases of

* Inst. Cyr. l. 4. 1.

† Ibid. §. 3. Compare, however, the following from Demosth. adv. Neær. Ed. Reisk. p. 1351. 3. ss. Ἐπὶ γὰρ ταύτας παιδίσκας ἐκ μικρῶν παιδίων ἐκτήσατο Νικαρέτη . . . δεινὴ καὶ δυναμένη φύσει μικρῶν παιδίων συνιδεῖν εὐπρεπῆ, καὶ ταῦτα ἐπισταμένη θρέψαι καὶ παιδεύσαι ἐμπείρων.

‡ Hist. R. i. 7. m. Comp. S. Luke, iv. 16. Maccab. i. 3. 33.

§ Ephes. vi. 4.

Nutrio and Enutrio. This is confirmed by Arrian's using the simple noun *τροφή*, not the compound *ἐκτροφή*, in a remarkable passage,* which so closely resembles a text in the Epistle to the Hebrews; Οὐ θέλεις ἤδη, ὡς τὰ παῖδιά, ἀπογαλακτισθῆναι, καὶ ἄπτεσθαι στερεᾶς τροφῆς. By these words *στερεᾶς τροφῆς* the philosopher understood with respect to his ethical system what the Apostle meant to express in relation to his doctrine, each having its first principles, the food of infancy, and each its more recondite dogmas, the nutriment of maturer age.

I might here conclude my observations on this most interesting relation, which presents so attractive a feature in the social economy of the ancient Greeks, were it not that one remains as yet, to suppress all notice of which would be to leave my subject but imperfectly discussed. I speak here of a sentiment of a still higher order, of a yet more sacred character, more elevating in the faith, the trustfulness, and the hope which it inspired, than even the piety which the parent claimed, or the gratitude which was the meed of the nurturer; of the link, in fine, which united the mortal to his unseen guardian, the *Προστατήριος*† and *Ἀποτρόπαιος* of the Greek, the Roman "Tutelar" and "Averruncus." The deity who was selected for this momentous trust was regarded in the light of a nurturer, in the highest sense of the word, as well of communities as of individuals, fostering the infancy and adolescence of the one as well as of the other, protecting both in the hour of peril, and sharing the glories of both in the season of victory. The Homeric poems alone suffice to recall these facts to the memory of all who now hear me, so that farther research would be mere waste of time and incumbrance to my pages.

What then were the external symbols which "bodied forth" the emotions of the nursling of a deity, whether a political community or an individual, in recognition of this union? The reply is manifold. Hecatombs, games, altars, temples, the breathing forms which started at the artist's bidding from the insensate mass; the Olympian Zeus, the Pythian of Rhodos, the virgin Protectress of Athênai, the Knidian Aphrodite, miracles of genius and artistic skill still unsurpassed, and ever to remain so: such were the thank-offerings of Hellás, expressions of a profound, trustful, and ennobling consciousness; true threp-

* In Epictet. ii. 7. Comp. Hebr. v. 12.

† Vide Sept. c. Th. 449. s. *προστατηρίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἐννοίαισι, σὺν τ' ἄλλοις θεοῖς.*

terial oblations, which man rendered to his celestial guardians as the meed of past nurture and its earnest for the future.

These, however, were costly offerings, and certain amongst them could only be the creations of high art and social progress. But the sentiment which we may term their inner life descended, as we all know, from the earliest ages, when it found its expression in oblations suited to the simplicity of the times, more germane to primordial tastes, or, it may be, more allied to the rites of unadulterated theism. Let us, therefore, recede to the period of the nascent civilization of Greece, and seek amongst its simpler religious observances for some rite, itself the tradition of what was even then antiquity, of a sufficiently generic character to sustain our present view, and sanction the more enlarged conception of the threpterial office to which our remarks have conducted us.

The well-known oblation of the nurture-lock (for so we may translate *πλόκαμος θρεπτήριος**) appears to me to be one which satisfies all these conditions, it having been a sacred usage, simple in its character, of extreme antiquity, and of universal observance. A wide field of research here opens before me, into which neither my prescribed limits, nor the incidental nature of this notice, would justify my entering farther, at least, than is requisite to the proper elucidation of my subject. I content myself, therefore, with adverting briefly to a few prominent instances. We find it associated with the ritual observances of the Hindû of Arrian,† the Egyptian of Diódoros,‡ the Syrian of Lucian,§ the German of Tacitus,|| the Gaul of Silius,** and last of all, but meriting for obvious reasons a peculiar notice, of the Nazarite of Moses.†† In all these it is my firm persuasion that we are to recognise a ceremony, not originating in Pagan times, or the offspring of Pagan will-worship, but transmitted from the age of a purer, a patriarchal theism; that a connexion is here, obscurely it may be, but yet intelligibly, hinted between this natural integument of our species, and the rite-worship of a sincerer faith. For it appears to me to the last degree improbable that a usage of world-wide extension, one in which we find

* Vide Choëphóroi, init.

† Vide Indica, c. 7. fin. Ed. Gronov. 1704. Καὶ κομᾶν Ἰνδοὺς τῷ θεῷ, μητρηφορέειν τε ἀναδείξαι, viz. Διόνυσον.

‡ Bibl. H. l. 18.

§ Vide, de Syria dea, 53. 60.

|| Hist. iv. 61. Comp. the note by Lipsius.

** Punic. iv. 200. s.

†† Numbers, c. vi.

representatives of all races consentient, could have attained its ritual eminence in any other way than by its transmission from a common centre of union ; in other words, that the observance commenced at any period comparatively recent, when races had been dispersed, and become segregated from each other by obstacles then insurmountable. It appears to me that no alternative is left us but to ascend to the centre of which I speak ; and the nearer we approach to it the closer is our approximation to the pure theistic creed of our species.

But let us consider the matter of the rite in itself. What element is there in the physical system of man better adapted to symbolize growth and maturation? what, therefore, more appropriate as a dedicatory offering in consideration of the agencies of power and sustentation inherent in the First Cause of all, "in Whom we live, and move, and have our being"? I here speak with reverence, and shelter myself against all imputation of presumption under the shield of the Nazaritic institution. I cannot but think, too, that the argument acquires force by considering the case of the perpetual Nazarite . . . the נָזִיר אֱלֹהִים מִן־הַבָּטָן,* whom we may perhaps regard as the veritable representative of those who existed under the primeval dispensation. Our concern at present is but with one of this class, the judge and champion of the oppressed Israëlites, whose endowment was the physical attribute of superhuman strength. With what feature of his system was this ostensibly connected? Our great epic poet, himself a theologian, replies, in the words which he attributes to the captive Nazarite :†

" God, when He gave me strength, to shew withal
How slight the gift was, hung it in my hair ;"

that is, made this manifestation of Himself in my person dependent on my observance of the institutes of my Nazariteship, of which my unshorn locks were the visible mark and sign. I ask, is there nothing in this to awaken our reflection, more especially when it is viewed in connexion with the universally prevalent ethnical ceremony, the perversion in which consisted in men's losing sight of the Original, Whose right the offering was, and consecrating the latter, as endued with a peculiar sanctity, to an imaginary guardian? Yet, in this as in other instances, has it pleased the Almighty to inwrap and preserve the vitality of

* Judges, XIII. 5.

† Vid. "Samson Agonistés."

the pure germ of truth even in the aberrations of Gentilism, thus to shadow forth the rite-worship of his primeval manifestation to man: for who can shut his eyes against the consentient testimonies of the heathen writers themselves? One might almost imagine, while reading the lines of Valerius* in the case of one of his heroes:

“Tectus et Eurytion, servato colla capillo,
Quem pater Aonias reducem tondebit ad aras,”

that he witnessed the closing scene of the temporary Nazarite, who, when the period of his vow had expired, was shorn of his hair, which never left the sanctuary of the Most High, but was burnt by the priest on the altar of the peace-offering.†

In effect, I have always been accustomed to regard the Ethnical rite of tonsure as standing in the same relation to a primeval original, as the Ethnical rite of sacrifice to its patriarchal forerunner. No one doubts now of the affinity between the latter, however he may deplore the idolatrous perversions by which the bond was loosened: why then deny the relationship between the former, unless it may be urged, that we possess certain notices of the sacrificial ordinance, of which we are wholly destitute in the instance of the Nazaritic? This might be a valid reason for withholding assent to our proposition, did the two institutions stand upon the same level; but such is far from being the case: the reasons for perpetuating notices of the former of these institutions were so immeasurably more weighty and stringent than any which could originate a mention of the latter, that we cease to desiderate any memorial of it in comparison, and consequently cannot recognise the silence of the inspired record as a satisfactory ground of argument.

These observations, as will doubtless have occurred to many of my auditory, have been ventured with reference to the theory of the profoundly learned author of “The Ritual Laws of the Hebrews,” a section of which work is devoted to the rites transplanted into the Mosaic ceremonial from the Gentile nations, the “Tonsure of the Nazarites” occupying the fourth place amongst these.‡ As my present is not a theological essay, I have deemed it sufficient

* Argonaut. l. 378. a.

† Numbers, vi. 18.

‡ De Legibus, etc. iii. 6. pp. 693. ss. The same arguments apply also to the view of Michaelis.

barely to notice the objectionable principle which this theory involves in reference to one particular rite, insomuch as it presents a feature of the Ethnic ritual of the Greeks. Yet, ere I conclude my remarks on this head, I cannot refrain from asking one more question; why, had the Hebrews derived it from their Egyptian task-masters, did the same code which regulated the observance of the Nazaritic rite ordain also, in express terms, that the hair should not be nurtured into a "Sisóe,"* meaning thereby a lock consecrated to Krónos, the Seb of the Egyptian idolater? We perceive here, that a practice with an idolatrous intent was prohibited, which, with certain precautionary restrictions, was recognised by the Nazaritic institutes. One might be disposed to argue from these premises that nothing was more foreign to the intention of the Supreme Legislator, than to ingraft into His ritual an observance borrowed from the apostate Gentiles.

Apart from his theory, however, and with respect to the principle of this rite as practised by heathen peoples, SPENCER observes most truly:† "Apud Ægyptios et alios instituto veteri comparatum erat ut capillos, sub exeuntis pueritiæ tempora, numinibus eorum devoverent; ut munusculo illo deos generationis et augmentationis auctores grati agnoscerent, et iis ipsa capita sua debita et devota sancte profiterentur;" appealing at the same time, in proof of this, to the Scholia of TZÉTZES on Hesiod. These Scholia, which illustrate the Georgic poem of that author, are replete with curious speculation on the subject of the Esoteric meaning of the Ethnical theology, and so conduct us at least one step nearer to the primordial theism of our species, by divesting the Pántheion of the gross and material impersonations of its exoteric phasis. I select one example amongst many, as it bears in some degree on our present subject.

Hesiod has included in his characteristics of his second age the following:‡

οὐδ' ἀθανάτους θεραπεύειν

"Ἡθελον, οὐδ' ἔρδειν μακάρων ἱεροῖς ἐπὶ βωμοῖς.

On which passage TZÉTZES has offered us this exégesis:§ "Men were reluctant to worship the gods, as being spiritual powers, in temples or on altars.

* Vide Leviticus, xix. 27. Lxx. Spencer. de Legg. H. p. 694.

† Ibid. iii. 6. §. 1. p. 696.

‡ Opp. et DD. vv. 134. a.

§ Ed. Gaisf. Hesiod. tom. iii. p. 106.

They consigned them, therefore, to the mind" (meaning thereby, the worship of the intelligence). "Their proper altar was the region of the head, that is, the rational principle, agreeably with what Eurípides says: 'Persuasion hath no other temple but Reason, and her altar is in the nature' (that is, the rational nature) 'of man.'" Divest this comment of its polytheism, and what a dignity its concluding words add to the simple and expressive rite which we are now discussing; the sustentation of our physical nature being lost sight of in comparison with the gift of our intellectual.

Having touched upon the perversion (for such, in accordance with my view, I must term it) of this ceremony in countries which were the cradles of the civilization of our species, I return to Hellás, the germs of whose social and religious polity were transplanted from Central Asia, the shores of the Mediterranean, and the country of Dánaos, Ínachos, and Kékrops. The same result accordingly took place there, with no counteracting influence to avert it, and idolatry pursued its course unmolested. A Tutelary was selected, the obligation of a vow to him contracted, and at the appointed season the lock which had been "nurtured" for the occasion of the solemnity was offered as an *εὐχαριστήριον*, an oblation of gratitude for his protecting and nurturing care.* Who this guardian might be seemed to have been left to choice, or some mythical association. Thus, to adduce a few instances, the citizen of Agýrion selected Iólaos,† the associate of Heraklês; the Athenian, in imitation of Theseús,‡ made choice of Apóllon, the *Κουροτρόφος* and *ἀποτρόπαιος*, the impersonation of the Luminary, life-giving and life-restoring. Again, we find Spercheiós, an enchorial god, marked out by Achilleús as the recipient of his offering, he being a representative of another element, so necessary to the growth and maturescence of living things;§ for which reason indeed the choice in such cases generally devolved upon river-gods and fountain-tutelaries. Ínachos, the mythical founder of Árgos, is represented by Aischýlos as selected by Oréstes,

* Compare on this and what follows, Pitisc. "Antiqq." vol. I. pp 517. s.

† Vid. Diódor. iv. 24.

‡ Plutarch in Theseo, v. init.

§ Vide Eustáth. in Iliad, ψ' 140. p. 1403. Ed. Basil. 1560. "Εθός ην τρέφειν κόμην τοὺς νέους μέχρι καὶ ἀκμῆς· εἴτα κείρειν αὐτὴν ἐγγχωρίοις ποταμοῖς. ἐποιοῦν δὲ οὕτω, τιμῶντες τὸ καλὸν ὕδωρ τρόφειμον γὰρ φασί, καὶ συστατικόν ἐστὶ τοῦ ζῆν. See also the Scholiast on Pindar. Pyth. iv. 145. s.

in the opening scene of one of his dramas,* where he describes him as approaching the grave of his sire, and depositing thereupon, as on an altar, his votive and mourning oblations.

These examples may suffice to prove the firm hold which this rite had obtained of the Greek mind during the heroic age, the traditions of which open a department of research so surpassingly interesting to the historian and archæologist. Scarcely less interesting are the records which (to speak so) embody these traditions; which bring us into contact with them, endued with a sensible and living form, by their commemoration of actors, their names and circumstances, and frequently the emotions which they experienced. I refer here to inscriptions; those especially of the latter days of Greece, which prove incontestably the retention, in all its simplicity, of this solemnity of the *πλόκαμος θρεπτήριος*, and on no occasion more tenaciously adhered to, or with profounder feeling, than when it was the thank-offering for the restoration of a beloved object, in renovated health and vigour, to the domestic circle. Then it was that Asklepiós and the deified abstraction Hygieia, regarded in the light of true *θρεπτήρες*, were presented by the parent with the charisterial oblation of the first-shorn locks of his recovered child. They had become his Tutelaries, and accordingly were adjudged the Tutelary's honour.

I shall trespass on my auditory with but two instances of this observance. tituli of Páros, which Böckh has published from various sources; one† announcing the mere fact of the offering, and for that very reason perhaps not the less interesting: the second‡ expressed in more ambitious language, but valuable on account of its greater precision. The former proceeds thus: **ΕΠΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΟΣ . ΕΠΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΟΥ . ΥΠΕΡ . ΤΟΥ . ΠΑΙΔΙΟΥ . ΕΠΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΟΥ . ΤΗΝ . ΠΑΙΔΙΚΗΝ . ΤΡΙΧΑ . ΥΓΙΑ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΩ .** The latter: **ΤΗΝ . ΠΡΩΤΟΤΜΗΤΟΝ . ΤΡΙΧΑ . ΤΗΝ . ΕΦΗΒΙΗΝ . ΚΕΙΡΑΣ . ΕΘΗΚΕ . ΕΣΤΡΑΤΟ ΝΕΙΚΟΣ . ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ . ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΩ . ΥΓΕΙΑ . ΤΕ . ΔΩΡΟΝ . ΑΥΤΟΣ . ΥΠΕΡ . ΤΟΥ . ΥΟΥ . ΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΝΕΙΚΟΥ . ΧΑΡΙΝ .**

* Choëphóroi, 7. s.

† Corp. Inscr. vol. II. p. 349. n. 2391.

‡ Ibid. n. 2392. As illustrative of this, compare Pausanías on the statue of Hygieia in the Asklepieion of Titáne: *Ὅν κ' ἂν οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἴδοις ῥαδίως, οὕτω περιέχουσιν αὐτὸ κόμαι τε γυναικῶν, αἱ κείρονται τῇ θεῷ.*

I here conclude my exégesis of this highly interesting record, which has extended to greater length than I had at first any reason to contemplate. My learned audience must, however, have perceived ere this, that a briefer notice would have failed of doing justice to its contents, each particular word of which suggests considerations external to their boundary-line on this marble. Nothing could have been easier than to have dismissed them with notices co-extensive with this limit; but then I must have denied myself the satisfaction of having fulfilled the trust so disinterestedly reposed in me by my excellent friend in the manner and to the extent which alone could have responded to his wishes. From the course which I have pursued hitherto, and purpose to continue, it must have appeared that this imposes upon me the two-fold duty of rectifying misconceptions and of replacing them with sounder views; the former of which were the unavoidable results, in part of epistolary haste, but mainly of unmaturing study, and the want of those advantages which an enlarged experience in epigraphic literature alone can supply. SMITH wrote at a period when this had scarcely emerged from its infancy, and therefore he could not be expected to have anticipated its riper growth: yet to him the merit belongs of having effected much, in the comparatively limited circle to which he confined himself, in advancing it to that growth; for after his time, and doubtless influenced by his example, commenced the memorable labours of CHISHULL, SHERARD, and POCOCKE. But more than this; his name can never be mentioned without honour by the Christian traveller, as the first successful explorer of a region which, to the end of time, cannot fail of awakening the profoundest sympathies of the Christian's heart.*

SECTION II.

I NOW proceed to the consideration of the associate marble, which, for distinction's sake, I shall take leave to term, from the noun, either proper or ethnic, with which its epigraph concludes, "the sculpture of Attikós;" premising

* Vide ARUNDELL's "Visit to the Seven Churches of Asia," etc., published in 1828. This writer commences his volume with a brief account of the labours of his predecessors in this range of discovery, beginning with SMITH, who entered upon his journey in April, 1671. Its result was the identification of the sites of Thyáteira and Laodíkeia: pp. 1-4.

that the difficulties and doubts which now beset me lead to my calculating largely on the indulgence of my audience. To the untoward circumstances which have originated these I have already alluded, in the commencement of this Memoir, namely, the injuries which, in common with the anaglyph it was designed to illustrate, this titulus has sustained. It will be observed that, in consequence of these mishaps, considerable portions of its two component lines have disappeared, rather more, perhaps, than one-half of each. It is true, we are enabled in some degree to redress this, by the aid of the "Inscriptiones Antiquæ" of GUDIUS,* in which the first line, as it appears in our marble, has been augmented in the beginning by five letters, the second remaining still in the exact condition in which it had left Smýrna; a consolation, doubtless, when the distance of that port from our shores a century and a half since is considered; yet one of a negative kind. The pity is, that fortune did not reverse its favours, or, to speak more correctly, perhaps, ill-will its injuries, the restitution of the second line in its present state being a task of much greater difficulty than that of the first would have been, even supposing it not to have had the benefit of VAN DER HOOFT's supplement: for the self-same research which has served to identify the "New City of the Myesians," would unquestionably have restored it even on the data supplied by the epigraph in its present condition.

These concurrent authorities sanction our reading this epigraph as follows:

***** ΤΗΝΝΕΑΝΜΥΗΣΙΩΝΠΟΛΙΝ
***** ΤΙΑΣ<ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ

that is, "the New City of the Myesians - - - - - Attikós." The five letters, ΤΗΝΝΕ, which commence the first line have now disappeared from the marble, an injury which in all probability took place during its transit from Smýrna.†

It now remains that we address ourselves to the task of supplying these lacunæ in some satisfactory way, and this involves a somewhat extensive field of research: for, in the first place it will be necessary to define within the limits of probability the character of the inscription, and, as a consequence from

* See the notices of this collection given by Dr. TODD in the Proceedings R. I. A. ubi supr. pp. 49.s.

† The reader is referred to the close of the present Section of this Memoir for a statement of the reasons which have led me to suppose that the injuries sustained by this anaglyph and its inscription, antecedently to the period of VAN DER HOOFT's copying it, had been intentional.

this, the Intention of the donor: secondly, whether he was a Greek or a Roman, or ethnically allied to both these: in the third place, we are to assign its true geographical position to the town here denominated "The New City of the Myesians:" then, lastly, to determine from these results to what Original the anaglyph before us is, in all likelihood, to be referred; an investigation in no small degree perplexing, as the titulus in its present state supplies us with no data which we can reckon as positively certain, and thus we have to seek her either in the realm of Myth, or in the Religious associations of the community here mentioned, or in that Community itself politically considered; or, finally, in a combination of one or other of these with some actual Historical personage. Supposing, however, all these difficulties to be surmounted, we are bound to give expression to our final result in the current epigraphic idiom of the territory from which the monument originally came.

From this summary no candid auditory will be at a loss to appreciate the extreme difficulty, one almost amounting to an impossibility, of combining all these investigations in a single indisputable result, since, as I have already observed, the present condition of the epigraph presents most formidable obstacles to our establishing anything with absolute certainty respecting the first, second, and fourth of these heads of inquiry. All that I can hope to accomplish is, to traverse, as far as my resources will enable me, the area of investigation, to view the problem which presents itself for solution under its varying aspects, and, in default of my satisfying you with certainties, offer you at least probabilities, each resting on its own peculiar ground of acceptance. Exclusively of this, I hope, by identifying the city whose name has been here so fortunately preserved, to perform a service to geography and numismatics; and by investigating the Archetype, in accordance with which both these anaglyphs have been elaborated, to vindicate their claim to a more than common antiquarian interest.

I now proceed with my several heads of research, reserving to myself the order of their consideration. Our first question is, What may we presume to have been the intention of the donor of this anaglyph from the yet extant notices of his epigraph? My answer is, that my persuasion, on a first inspection of both, was, and still continues to be, that he presented the monument as a *Χαριστήριον*, a term which the Greeks employed to denote a Thank-offering, in

the instance of a deity, a Thank-gift, when communities or individuals were concerned. Of these distinct species of *charistéria* it may be proper to adduce a few examples, as a critical insight into the style and spirit of the *tituli* which accompanied them may benefit me very much in my succeeding remarks.

I select my first example from the collection of Lycian inscriptions which forms part of the third volume I have published. The marble which bore it had been a votive altar, therefore a true *Donarium*, or Thank-offering, dedicated to *Hermês Propýlaios*, whom we may presume to have been an especial object of adoration to the dedicator from the position which he occupied. It proceeds thus: * **ΣΩΣΙΚΛΗΣ . ΝΙΚΑΓΟΡΑ . ΣΑΜΙΟΣ . ΕΠΙΣΤ[ΑΤ]ΗΣΑΣ . ΕΝ . ΤΗΙ . ΚΑΣΤΑΒΙ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΠΙ . ΤΟΥ . ΠΥΡΓΟΥ . ΕΝ . ΜΕΓΙΣΤΑΙ . ΕΡΜΑΙ . ΠΡΟΠΥΛΑΙΩΙ . ΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ .**

In the following, a Sarmatian *titulus* "*ex ora Hylææ*," as localized by Böckh,† on the authority of BLARAMBERG, who found it inscribed on a marble *stèle* beneath an epigraph, in the same way as the inscription before us, we perceive the fuller and more expressive term adopted: **ΑΜΕΡΙΜΝΟΣ . ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝΟ[Υ] . [ΥΠΕΡ . ΥΓΙΕΙΑΣ] . ΚΑΙ . ΩΤΗΡΙΑΣ . ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗ[ΡΙΟΝ]**. Here the name of the recipient is not mentioned; but we may presume with confidence that the convalescent *Amérimnos* had dedicated his charisterial offering to *Achilleús*, who, under his deified aspect, was the Tutelary of the district.

We may now cite an example of the use of this term in the second of the above-mentioned significations, "Thank-gift," or "Memorial of grateful remembrance." This is supplied by the following *titulus*, copied from a pedestal which had originally supported a statue of *Heraklês* in the *Gymnásion* of *Mýlasa*, and published in my second volume of *Inscriptions*: ‡ **ΠΑΠΙΑΣ . Β . ΤΟΥ . ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣ . Ο . ΚΑΛΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ . ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ . ΑΡΧΩΝΗΣ . ΞΥΣΤΟΥ . ΤΟ . Β . ΤΟΝ . ΗΡΑΚΛΕΑ . ΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ . ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ . ΤΗ . ΣΥΝΕΡΓΑΣΙΑ**. I may here anticipate a remark suggested by this *titulus*, which will be found serviceable in the course of my restorations. This is twofold: firstly, the metonymical use of *τὸν Ἡρακλέα* to express the donation, *τὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἄγαλμα*, and secondly, the defining its precise character, in other words, the intent of the

* Vide Fascic. III. p. 57. n. CCXC. a.

† Corp. Inscr. II. p. 144. n. 2096. a.

‡ Fascic. II. p. 80. n. CVII. c.

donor, by a term placed in apposition (*ἐπεξηγήσεις*) with *Ἡρακλέα*, namely, *Χαριστήριον*. The correct translation, therefore, is: "This statue (or bust) of Heraklēs, a thank-gift." There occur, however, instances in which one of these, either the term denoting the gift or offering, or that which denotes its character, is left out, when sufficiently obvious to the spectator. Thus, in the Sarmatian titulus lately cited, Amérimnos does not tell us that his charistérion was the anaglyph which that epigraph accompanied, this, doubtless, in its original state, having been sufficiently plain; and the same holds good in a titulus of Knídos, which also occurs in my second volume: * **ΣΑΡΑΠΙΔΙ . ΙΣΙΔΙ . ΘΕΟΙΣ . ΠΑΣΙ . ΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΘΕΙΣ . ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΑΣ . ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΥΣ . ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΑΝ**. Here, as the thank-offering, a votive altar, spoke for itself, **ΤΟΝ . ΒΩΜΟΝ** has been omitted as wholly superfluous. It is worthy of remark, also, that in this titulus the term *εὐχαριστία*, which expresses the sentiment, replaces the more usual *χαριστήριον*, which denotes the quality, nearly in the same way that *χάρις* did in the last of the Parian inscriptions cited at the close of my former section.

These authorities prove the occasional omission of the first member of the apposition: that of the second can be as easily demonstrated. For example; a titulus from Xánthos, published in my third volume,† proceeds thus: **ΑΙΩΝ . ΕΠΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΟΥ . ΤΟΥ . ΑΙΩΝΟΣ . ΞΑΝΘΙΟΣ . ΑΝΕΣΤΗΛΑ . ΤΟΝ . ΑΝΔΡΙΑΝΤΑ . ΕΚ . ΤΩΝ . ΙΔΙΩΝ . ΤΗ . ΠΑΤΡΙΔΙ**. Here the very mention of Aíon's native city (*πατρίς*) as the recipient of his offering, proves its charisterial import; the omission, therefore, falls upon this, and *ἀνδριάντα* alone is retained, that is, the term which expresses the Matter of the offering.

This titulus suggests a question of some importance when viewed in connexion with the main end of the present inquiry, the identification of the sculpture of Attikós. We read in it *τὸν ἀνδριάντα*, but this conveys no information to the inquirer who now asks, What original did this statue represent? The subject was, doubtless, well known to the Xanthian community, as a decree of the municipal authorities had sanctioned the erection of the statue, but this was not sufficient to give it a more general publicity, or convey precise information to a succeeding age. That it was not an impersonation of the State itself is most evident, for then the expression would have been **ΤΟ . ΑΓΑΛΜΑ**.

* Ibid. p. 67. n. LXXXIX. a.

† Fascic. III. p. 107. n. CCCXX. i.

This proves incontestably that the authors of epigraphs did not at all times think it necessary to be absolutely, or I might say, prospectively determinate in their language. Our Thelymítres acted, we know, on the contrary principle, but who can assure us that the donor of the anaglyph at present before us was at all more considerate than the Xanthian?

The full meaning of the doubt which is here intimated will be better understood when I arrive at the first stage of my proposed restorations. I content myself, therefore, for the present with briefly adverting to it, in order to resume the course of my investigation relative to tituli of the charisterial type, or rather, in the position we now occupy, to the instruction which we may glean from those already cited, as the intelligence of my audience quite supersedes the necessity of my adding to their number with a view to any further exemplification of either their spirit or their expression. That there existed a studied harmony between both these and the offerings which they illustrated cannot for a moment be questioned, and therefore as little that the characteristics of either are the mirror in which we may best view the lineaments of the other.

To apply this, let us examine in what degree the sculpture of Attikós tends to inspire the belief that to the charisterial class it is to be assigned in preference to any other. The first object to which I would direct attention as characteristic, particularly by contrast with the associate sculpture, is the style in which the head-dress has been elaborated. Its approximation to the type generally known by the name of "the Faustina," which in its turn appears to have originated in the well-known "Kórymbos" of the Greeks, can hardly be questioned: and thus we are supplied with some ground of conjecture as to the rank of the female whom we may conclude to have been present to the mind of the sculptor. Agreeably to this, all other details to which it was requisite to devote attention seem to have been closely studied and elaborately carried out, so as to entitle this Protomé in an especial sense to the encomium bestowed upon both by the Editor of GUDRUS, "*Imagines adfabre sculptæ.*" My sole occasion of regret is, that in the prosecution of these details, the artist has introduced no accessories of the emblematical kind, as such would have been most important aids towards our identifying the anaglyph with exactness: but none such appear; and this, perhaps, is satisfactorily explained by his having been limited to a Protomé, especially one in relief. Even in medals it is very

rarely that we perceive the heads or half-lengths of the obverses accompanied by types, these having been reserved, in the great majority of cases, for the reverses. Yet, notwithstanding our inability to prove anything in this way, I think we may safely conclude that we possess in this sculpture either an impersonation of a deity, or a representation of a female of such elevated rank as to entitle her, by the recognized usage of her times, to bear the name and titles of one, and accordingly to become the recipient of the honour due to such as Prostátis or Archegétis, or as in any way the representative of a State. Now, these tributes of honour were in numberless instances true Charistéria; grateful acknowledgments of benefits conferred either directly or indirectly by the personages thus honoured.

To place this in a clearer light, I proceed to cite from epigraphs both of coins and medals a few examples of the honour of life-deification conferred upon the immediate female relatives of the Augusti.

The immediate members of the Augustine family shared, as it was natural to expect from the great popularity of their illustrious Head, very largely in this tribute of respect. To commence with Livia Drusilla: coins of Méthymna and Klazomené exhibit her effigies with the general title of **ΘΕΑ . ΛΙΒΙΑ**,* and another, also Greek, but not appropriated, styles her **ΙΟΥ . ΘΕΑ . ΣΕΒΑΣΤΗ**.† In a fourth she impersonates Héra, as we are informed by the epigraph **ΛΙΒΙΑΝ . ΗΡΑΝ**;‡ and in a fifth Deméter, under the title **ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΟΣ**.§ A coin with her effigies, ascribed to Éphesos, and bearing the legend **ΑΡΤ . ΣΕΒΑ**,|| a record of the gratitude of the city, even at the expense of the virgin honours of its Tutelary, is mentioned by ΕΚΚΗΛ. Again: Julia, the daughter of Augustus by Scribonia, has her title to life-deification established by a coin, possibly one of Novum Ilium, which exhibits the legend, **ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝ . ΑΦΡΟΔΕΙΤΗΝ**;** and his niece Antonia, who was also the daughter of his rival the Triumvir, is denominated **ΘΕΑ**.

* Vide Eckhel, Doctr. N. V. tom. vi. p. 148. a.

† Ibid. p. 152. b.

‡ Ibid. p. 148. a.

§ Ibid. p. 153. a. 168. b. *Καρποφόρος* means *Δημήτηρ*, i. e. Ceres. Thus in a titulus of Κύμη (Böckh, II. p. 852. n. 3528.), **ΘΕΑΣ . ΑΙΟΛΙΔΟΣ . ΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΑΣ . ΑΓΡΙΠΠΕΙΝΑΣ**, viz. the elder, consort of Germanicus.

|| Viz. *Ἀρτεμις Σεβαστή*. Eckhel, ubi supra, p. 152. b.

** Ibid. p. 168. a. ΕΚΚΗΛ attributes this coin to Smyrna or Pérgamos.

ΚΑΙ.ΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΙC in a titulus of the same place, which I have published in my second volume of Inscriptions.* The name of her daughter Livia also occurs in the same, with the adjuncts, **ΘΕΑC . ΑΦΡΟΔΕΙΤΗC . ΑΝΧΕΙCΙΑΔΟC**; and from other sources we learn that even a higher distinction was conferred on one of her daughters-in-law, the notorious Valeria Messalina, namely, the impersonation of Héra. Thus, in one of the proconsular coins of Bithynia we meet the epigraph, **ΜΕCΣCΑΛΕΙΝΑ . CΕΒΑCΤΗ . ΝΕΑ . ΗΡΑ.†**

Passing now to the times of Hadrian and the Antonini, including under these last the family of Septimius Severus, we observe the Augusta Sabina addressed by the inhabitants of Eleusis under the title, **Η . ΝΕΩΤΕΡΑ . ΘΕΟC,‡** which is still more explicitly stated in an inscription of Mégara, **CΑΒΕΙΝΑΝ . ΒΑCΙΛΙCCΑΝ . CΕΒΑCΤΗΝ . ΝΕΑΝ . ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑ.§** The first of these occurs in a titulus wherein mention is made of her altar; and the second, if we are to credit SPON, was copied from a zophóros, which might seem to imply that a temple had been dedicated to her as impersonating Deméter. We have some reason to conclude that the same impersonation was subsequently accorded to Annia Faustina,|| and still more for asserting in behalf of Julia Domna, that the citizens of Lámpsakos conferred upon her the twofold honour of representing both Hestia and Deméter; for the titulus in one of the Oxford marbles** commencing **ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝ . CΕΒΑCΤΗΝ . ΕCΤΙΑΝ . ΝΕΑΝ . ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑ**, unquestionably relates to her, and not to Livia Drusilla.

I conclude this series with Fulvia Plautilla, the ill-starred consort of Caracalla, a head of whom appears on a coin†† of the Karian city Álinda, accompanied by the epigraph **ΠΛΑΥΤΙΛΛΑ . ΝΕΑ . ΘΕΑ . ΗΡΑ**, and whose family-

* Vide Fascic. II. p. 197. n. CCVI. a.

† Eckhel. T. II. p. 402. a.

‡ Böckh, C. I. I. p. 458. n. 435.

§ Ibid. p. 566. n. 1073. This cult of the people of Mégara is illustrated by Pausanias, I. 40. 5. and 44. 4.

|| Vide Inscr. Triop. Herod. II. vv. 6. 48. and Fiorill. not. in loc.

** Böckh, tom. II. p. 909. n. 3642.

†† This remarkable coin, which we shall have occasion to notice more particularly hereafter, has been described by HAYM in his "Tesoro Britannico," vol. II. p. 246. and figured in tab. XVI. n. 4. The reverse exhibits Caracalla under the type of Heraklēs, which is illustrated by the passage in Spartianus (Carac. v. fin.); "Exegit apros frequenter: contra leonem etiam stetit: quo etiam missis ad amicos litteris gloriatus est; seque ad Herculis virtutem accessisse jactavit."

name and imperial title I found merged in the similar ascription **NEA . HPA . ΠΩΜΑΙΑ** in a titulus which I have published in my second volume from the site of the Phrygian Lákina.* To this, as meriting especial notice, I shall have occasion to refer in the course of the present section.

There can hardly exist a doubt of the conclusion which we are to draw from this review. In every instance here cited of respect paid to a member of the Augustine family, we cannot but infer from what we know of the relations which subsisted between it and the Grecian communities, that a sense of benefits conferred must necessarily have been the ruling motive. Then, the reign of Hadrian was one continued series of favours lavished on the Greek name. His successors, the Antonini, were scarcely less distinguished by their predilections towards their subjects of Greece; and the memorials to which I have referred in the cases of the Augustæ, Domna and Plautilla, one the decree of a municipal body, and the other a record of patriotism on the part of a tried and faithful Greek official, attest the same in behalf of the family of Septimius Severus.

Let us now strengthen these evidences by attending to what remains of the epigraph before us. I esteem myself warranted in presuming that the introduction of the name of the Myesian city into its first line affords us strong grounds for the conclusion that the framer thereof had been actuated by some public principle; in other words, that it was not a merely private friendship or personal sentiment which he wished to place on record, as was the case with Thelymitres, but a matter, possibly an event, of public concern. What other could this have been but some act or series of acts of beneficence towards the Myesian community? Or, supposing even a personal motive, why particularize the State, unless his benefactress had been associated, directly or indirectly, with its weal also? I have conceived, moreover, that the four letters which commence the second line of this fragment form the two concluding syllables of a word precisely expressive of the charisterial import; but on this I refrain from insisting at present, as by doing so I should very reasonably expose myself to the imputation of conducting my argument in a vicious circle. The utmost length, therefore, I shall proceed now, is to assume, on the ground of my preceding notices, the high probability of this monument having been a Charistérion; from which

* Fascic. II. p. 248. n. CCXLIII. a.

position I shall direct my views towards ascertaining to what extent the components of its epigraph, together with other co-ordinate evidences, sustain my assumption.

Agreeably to this method of proceeding, the next observation which I shall offer regards the construction. We find the fourth case used in designating the city, not the third; **ΝΕΑΝ . ΠΟΛΙΝ**, not **ΝΕΑΙ . ΠΟΛΕΙ**. This, as it is certain that the verb, whether expressed or understood, was **ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ**, proves either of two things, namely, that we are to receive **ΝΕΑΝ . ΠΟΛΙΝ** in a purely local sense, or, without any direct reference to place at all, in a meaning strictly exegetical.

My third observation, which is but an extension of the foregoing, relates to the construction of the sentence which constitutes what we may term the Formula of Gift or Oblation. When complete, it includes the following: a specification of either of these, as the circumstance may require, in the fourth case; of the deity or community to whom it is presented, in the third; of the place for which it is destined, in the fourth, constructed with the preposition *εἰς*, and the verb, sometimes *ἀνέστησε*, more frequently *ἀνέθηκε*. The tituli which I have lately cited contain partial illustrations of this rule; but the following from Heródotos* exemplify it more fully: *Ἐπεθύμησε γὰρ Ῥοδῶπις μνημῆϊον ἐωυτῆς ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καταλιπέσθαι, ποίημα ποιησαμένη τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ τυγχάνει ἄλλῃ ἐξευρημένον καὶ ἀνακείμενον ἐν ἱρῷ, τοῦτο ἀναθεῖναι ἐς Δελφοὺς μνημόσυνον ἐωυτῆς. Again: Ἀνέθηκε δὲ καὶ ἀναθήματα ὁ Ἄμασις εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα· τοῦτο μὲν, ἐς Κυρήνην ἄγαλμα ἐπίχρυσον Ἀθηναίης, καὶ εἰκόνα ἐωυτοῦ γραφῇ εἰκασμένην τοῦτο δὲ, τῇ ἐν Λίνδῳ Ἀθηναίῃ δύο τε ἀγάλματα λίθινα κ. τ. λ.*

We now perceive the reason why **ΕΙΣ** must be restored to the inscription before us, when **ΝΕΑΝ . ΠΟΛΙΝ** is supposed to stand for the place which it signifies, and why it would be improper to introduce it when the latter is merely an exégesis of the thing offered.

I now proceed to my fourth subject of consideration, that is, **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ**, which concludes the fragment. Does it acquaint us with the name of the writer, and the donor of this sculpture, or are we to elicit this name from the four letters which go before and receive *Ἀττικός* in its Ethnical sense, that is,

* Vide II. 135. m. 182. init.

as denoting his country, Attiká? SMITH was inclined at first to adopt the second of these meanings, but subsequently, as appears from the Postscript of his letter to Primate MARSH, rejected this hypothesis; whether for valid reasons or the contrary, it may be requisite to examine. The following is his statement:—“The setter-up of this monument was, I suppose, a Greeke of Attica, and the word preceding it may be the name of the tribe or δῆμος to which hee belonged.” It may be quite possible, however, to concede the first of these suppositions without subscribing to the second, which can be proved to be quite untenable. In the first place the fragment ΤΙΑΣ, which commences the second line, could not possibly represent the genitive final of any of the Athenian Φυλαί, which, in every instance but one, is ἴδος, and with equal certainty, we cannot reproduce from it the first case of the Ethnic of any of the Attic Δῆμοι. It might appear from SMITH’s Postscript, that he had abandoned this view from his inability to surmount the difficulty here noticed; for his words are:—“I begun soone to doubt of my conjecture about Atticus, as if it had been a patronymic, and the name of the tribe or δῆμος of Attica prefixed.” But then, his proper course would have been, not to have exchanged it for one equally untenable, but asked the question, Is it at all necessary to suppose that the fragment above-mentioned had any connexion with territorial or social distributions, or impossible that Ἀττικός could be the Ethnic of Ἀττικά without a concurrent mention of these? So far from it, that the very contrary holds good; the presence of the latter, as affording the more special designation, would render the former, as the more general, wholly superfluous. But my venerable predecessor in this inquiry has committed another oversight. He has confounded circumstances so different as those of a citizen of Attiká in his own country and in a foreign one, when proceeding on the hypothesis that a designation which was requisite for certain purposes of state-policy in the one should also be adopted in the other. Exclusively of this, he has failed of defining with correctness the order in which the Demotic and Phyletic designations of the citizen were placed relatively to his name. Every one conversant with this subject is aware that the institution of the Δῆμοι, and their subordination to this or that particular Φυλή in certain groups subserved to social order in general,

• Proceedings R. I. A. ubi supr. p. 51.

and specially, to the prevention of offences, whether against property or the person. Here the circumstantial character of the Athenian identifications in all matters of municipal concern, forensic questions, testamentary provisions, contracts public or private, and generally, in all legal instruments. The name of each party concerned in their validation, the name of his father, in some cases that of his Phylé, and always that of his Dêmos, followed in regular succession when a complete identification was judged expedient: but in cases such as the present, when no such necessity existed, nay, when the observance of such technicalities would be quite out of place and at variance with the style of the epigraph itself, I can see no reason why it should have been adopted. Nor was it, in point of fact, as can be proved by an example, familiar, doubtless, to many here present. Pausanías* has preserved the inscription that was engraved beneath the feet of the Olympian statue, in which the illustrious sculptor described himself as Φειδίας Χαρμίδου υἱὸς Ἀθηναῖος. Here we have no mention made of his Phylé; and that the paternal name might have been left out without contravention of usage is most certain, as nearly every page in any collection of inscriptions testifies, and even the Athenian lists themselves, in which this formality was not always rigidly observed. We may presume, therefore, that in retaining it the exile consulted his private feelings.

This argument acquires still more force when the forms of the character now before us are taken into consideration. They evidently belong to a Græco-Roman age, and that not an early one; probably of the Antonini, including their immediate successors. To this question it is my intention to revert hereafter. In the mean time I hope I may presume on its having been satisfactorily proved, that SMITH discarded his first hypothesis somewhat too hastily, and consequently that, for all he has advanced to the contrary, the concluding noun of this epigraph may have been an Ethnic, informing us that the donor of the anaglyph was a Greek of Attiká. But then, prior to our admission of this, certain difficulties remain to be surmounted. It is clear, in the first place, that he must have occupied some eminent social position to entitle him in any way to be the donor of this sculpture to the community mentioned in the epigraph. This being the case, what conceivable necessity could exist for introducing any

* Vide v. 10. 2.

Ethnical designation, when a sufficient one was supplied by his own social station? It could only serve to incumber a record of other notices far more imperative, for which there was already but too little space on the stéle. Again: supposing even that he chose to be described by an Ethnic, why should Attikós be the one selected? Had he been a native of Athens, we may be quite sure that he would have described himself as *Ἀθηναῖος*, and if not, that he would either have dispensed with any Ethnical denomination, or adopted, according to the usage in his own country, that of his *Dêmos*, with the certainty that it would have been perfectly intelligible to the Myesian community, or any other in *Ionía*, quite as much so as to his own countrymen. But the Ethnic *Ἀττικός*, as designative of a native of Attiká, I may confidently affirm that I never yet have observed in any titulus of Asiatic Greece. I grant that "Atticus" was in common use amongst the Romans in the Gentilitial sense: nay, that *Ἀττικός* occurs as a designative Ethnic in Xenophôn, Lucian, and other writers, is certain: but I take my stand at present on the proprieties of epigraphic Greek in the region with which we are now concerned, and to these I conceive that it is quite opposed. The Ethnic designations, which alone are consistent therewith, are such as are formed from cities, not territories, at least in a majority of instances so large as to entitle me to propound it as a general rule. Thus, we never find an Ionian described as *Ἰωνικός*, or a Karian as *Κάρ*, or a Phrygian as *Φρύξ*, but all styled according to their respective cities or *πατρίδες*: if *Éphesos*, *Ἐφέσιος*, if *Halikarnassós*, *Ἀλικαρνασσεύς*, if *Laodíkeia*, *Λαοδικεύς*, and so in all other cases. This, I repeat, was the general practice; so general as to convince me that an Attic belonging, for example, to the *Dêmos* "Marathón" would have preferred describing himself in such an epigraph as the present by the Ethnic *Μαραθώνιος*, to employing *Ἀττικός* for that purpose: that is, he would have chosen the more special designation, and the one more in accordance with the epigraphic idiom of the country.

We are now conducted to the final difficulty which is to be surmounted ere we receive Attikós in its Ethnical meaning. This is, what we may term the Analogy of these Monuments: for both have been executed after precisely the same type of art, and even the dispositions in their epigraphs, so far as the defective state of one of them enables us to judge, are as nearly as possible identical. I except, of course, the local element introduced into the epigraph of Attikós,

and left out in that of Thelymítres: but that this does not disturb the analogy of which I speak is quite evident from our previous observations, as some such notice in the first of these originated in a necessity which we can hardly suppose to have existed in the latter. It will be remembered, moreover, that I made use of this as a cogent argument in behalf of the sculpture of Attikós having been a Municipal monument, and probably, therefore, of Historical importance.

It cannot, however, be denied, that at least one remarkable congruity is obvious, that is, in each concluding with a personal designation; and that others, not less worthy of notice, will exhibit themselves in the course of this discussion, I feel myself in a condition to promise; insomuch that, in all such components as are prescribed by a general formula, these two epigraphs will be found to run parallel to each other.

The inference which I have drawn from these analogies is, that both anaglyphs had originally been transported to Smýrna from the same site by the members of some Greek family who had migrated to that emporium, their selection of them having been, in all likelihood, determined by such obvious resemblances. Now, it is only extending the analogy here noticed, the sensible one, a step further, to argue that as "Thelymítres," the last component of the perfect epigraph, is unquestionably not to be understood in its Epithetic sense, so likewise we are not to receive Attikós, holding as it does the same position in the fragment before us, in its Ethnic: in other words, that the Onomastic import of the one having been placed beyond all doubt, we are to conclude the same of its co-ordinate. This reasoning, it is true, may appear to some who hear me to carry with it but little weight, yet it forces itself upon one who has studied these monuments in their style of art and their subordinate details so minutely, as to entitle his views respecting them to a reasonable share of consideration. We should bear in mind, also, that this argument is not to be received abstractedly, but as a link in a chain of proof, connected with and corroborating those already advanced.

I pause here to reply to an objection which may possibly be urged against this hypothesis. It may be said, that I am bound not to limit my analogy, but to take it in its full extent; and that this involves the inference, that Attikós was a name essentially Greek, as there is no doubt of that having been the case in the instance of Thelymítres. The briefest answer which I can return to this,

is, that indisputably it was, and not one due to the Romans; the "Atticus" of the latter being but a Greek Ethnic transformed into a cognomen, or, in certain cases, a Greek name Latinized. In proof of this I shall confine myself to inscriptions, and refer, in the first place, to the Municipal Lists of Athens, in which the name repeatedly occurs under such circumstances as to leave no room for doubting the purely Greek descent of those who bore it. Thus we observe in one* of those catalogues, **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ . ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΥ** and **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ . ΙΚΕΛΟΥ**; in another,† **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ . ΕΥΟΔΟΥ**; in a third,‡ **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ . ΞΕΝΟΦ.**, that is, **Ξενοφώντας**; and in a fourth,§ **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ . ΕΥΔΟΞΟΥ**.

I now pass to Asiatic Hellás, and cite from the number of tituli which I collected there one from Thyáteira,|| which contains this very name, applied to a member of a certain family, in juxtaposition with others bearing names purely Greek. It proceeds thus: **ΑΥΡ . ΜΑΤΡΙΑ . ΚΑΤΕΚΕΥΑΞΕ . ΤΟΝ . ΟΡΘΟ**
ΕΤΑΤΗΝ . ΕΑΥΤΗ . ΚΑΙ . ΤΩ . ΥΙΩ . ΑΤΤΙΚΩ . ΚΑΙ . ΤΗ . ΘΥΓΑΤΡΙ . ΝΕΙΚΗ . ΚΑΙ .
ΛΑΤΥΠΩ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗ. The names here mentioned, "Matría," "Neíke," "Látupos," "Asklepiádes," are confessedly Greek; so therefore was "Attikós;" and by these the Græco-Roman matron chose to designate her relatives, having provided sufficiently for the recognition of the family status, by recording her own Gentilicium. In this respect, therefore, and proceeding on the hypothesis that our 'Αττικός is also Onomastic, we recognise an important difference between its circumstances and those of the same name in the Thyatirene inscription, in its appearing unaccompanied by any intimation of the ancestral position of its bearer. Now, as it is abundantly clear that no Roman Gentilicium could be formed from the fragment which immediately precedes it, conjointly with any other combination of letters that it is possible to imagine, I deem myself authorized to advance a step farther and affirm, that our 'Αττικός indicates not only Greek, but also unmixed Greek descent: in other words, that the individual mentioned in this epigraph was not, like his isonyme of Thyáteira, a Græco-Roman. This will more fully appear from the following considerations: Whenever a person of Greek** descent stood connected with Rome by hereditary right, or became so by adoption (*νιοθεσία*), Manumission (*ἀπελευθέρωσις*), or any other recognized Legal act, it was the established custom to prefix to

* Böckh, C. I. i. p. 381. n. 275. vv. 56. 61.

† Ibid. p. 405. n. 303. l. 18.

‡ Fascic. i. p. 64. n. xiv. e. Comp. Fascic. ii. pp. 175. s.

† Ibid. p. 386. n. 277. v. 27.

§ Ibid. p. 448. n. 399. l. 12.

** Vide POSTSCRIPT, p. 187.

his Hellenic name both the Prænomen (τὸ Προσώνυμιον) and the Nomen (τὸ Ὄνομα), or at least the latter, of the particular Roman who had originated that connexion. This is so well known as scarcely to require proof; least of all to the student in epigraphic literature, to whom it is an elementary fact. I proceed, however, as is my wont, to cite a few examples in confirmation of what I have stated, limiting myself to the name with which we are at present more immediately concerned.

I select the first of these from CHANDLER,* who copied it from a marble in the temple of Zeús Olympos at Athens, in the epigraph of which we read at the close; **ΕΠΙ . ΙΕΡΕΩΣ . ΤΙ . ΚΛ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΥ**. This notice refers to the father of the still more celebrated Heródes, of both whom I shall soon have occasion to treat more particularly. We observe here his full Roman designation given, that is, the prænomen "Tiberius," and the nomen "Claudius," a formality which might appear to have been determined in part by the special importance of the occasion, and partly, it may be, by the taste of the individual commemorated, or his representative.

Another example is supplied by a sepulchral titulus which Böckh† has published from the traveller FOURMONT . . . the same person who has acquired so unenviable a distinction in this department of Greek literature. We possess here an additional instance of an Imperial nomen and prænomen: **ΑΡΤΕΜΩ . Τ . ΦΛ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΥ . ΜΕΙΛΗΣΙΑ**, that is, *Τίτου Φλαυίου*, thus pointing distinctly for its limit of age to the epoch of the first Flavian family.

That the introduction of the Prænomen was not, however, as I have already stated, a necessity, appears from the next example which I shall offer; an excerpt from an Athenian catalogue which has been published by Böckh‡ from Pococke and the traveller above-mentioned. In this we observe only the Nomen recited, yet the individual commemorated, being the grandson of the aforesaid Tiberius Claudius Attikós, was assuredly entitled to the complete designation. The entry respecting him appears thus: **ΚΗΡΥΞ . ΒΟΥΛΗΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΔΗΜΟΥ . ΚΛ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ**. Here **ΤΙ**, that is, *Τιβέριος*, has been left out as unnecessary under the circumstances, and **ΚΛ**, or *Κλαύδιος*, has been retained as the exponent of the "Gens" to which the members of the family were affiliated. It may be proper also to remark, in consideration of the high rank it

* Inscr. P. II. p. 57. n. 43.

† Corp. Inscr. T. I. p. 507. n. 696.

‡ Ibid. I. p. 418. s. n. 353. Col. III. 7. s.

held, and to obviate any misconception which might arise from the title *Κήρυξ* in the excerpt, that the bearer of it appears here amongst the Archons as an **AICEITOC** (*αείσιτος*), that is, a citizen who, in consideration of his public services, was entitled to daily entertainment in the Prytaneion.*

The inference which I would draw from this enumeration, proving as it does a scrupulous tenacity of Roman distinctions, is very unfavourable to the supposition of our Attikós having been a Greek-Roman. But some one may say: It is quite possible to sustain this hypothesis even on the data afforded by the epigraph in its present state. As Greeks had frequently double names, for instance, "Aristoklēs Molossós," in one of the tituli cited from Aphrodisiás,† might not our Attikós have been known also by another, the final syllables of which we possess in the fragment **ΤΙΑΣ**, and might not this have been preceded in its turn by an abbreviated Roman name and, perhaps, fore-name? What therefore, prevents our supposing that the stéle presented, in its perfect state, some such reading as the following; **ΤΙ . ΚΑ . ΑΡΙΣΤΙΑΣ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ**?

The perfect reasonableness of this, in the abstract, cannot be questioned, but to its application under present circumstances, the chasm which intervenes between **ΤΙΑΣ** and **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ** appears fatal. In the epigraph of Thelymitres, it is true, we find one between **ΚΑ** and **ΛΥΚΙΜΑΧΗ**, but this arose from the complexity of the name, which was Greek-Roman. It was to separate the latter element, more especially as it was given in an abridged form, from its associate, that the Choristic sign was introduced: but an instance has never yet occurred to me of two Greek names belonging to the same individual being disunited after this fashion in any marble or trustworthy manuscript that I have ever seen. The general practice in cases where it was judged proper to divide them was, to interpose between them a detail of the ancestral status of the individual, or when this was dispensed with, its place was supplied with *ὁ καί*, or, *ὁ καὶ καλούμενος*, or, omitting the conjunction, *ὁ καλούμενος*.‡

* Thus Plato describes Sokrátes as addressing his judges: *Εἰ οὖν δεῖ με κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον τῆς ἀξίας τιμᾶσθαι, τούτου τιμῶμαι, τῆς ἐν Πρυτανείῳ σιτήσεως.* *Apol. Sokr.* p. 36. e. In allusion to these words Cicero observes; "Qui honos apud Græcos maximus habetur." *De Orat.* i. 54.

† *Supr.* p. 94.

‡ Thus in the titulus of Mýlasi cited above, p. 110, we find, *Παπίας ὁ καλούμενος Διογένους.* *Comp. my Fascic. II. p. 124. n. CLII. n.*

What, then, was intended by the mark of separation which the engraver has so distinctly inserted between **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ** on the stéle? Evidently this; to bring out the name of the donor in sufficient prominence, and, so to express myself, relief, by interrupting the transition to it from the prescribed details of all such epigraphs; and, co-ordinately with this, to indicate the ellipsis which had become in these compositions a species of canon. Just so it is in the associate epigraph, which ends with the name of the donor as it had begun with that of the subject of the anaglyph, and whose mark of separation is supplied by the interval between the two lines. Let us suppose, however, that instead of **ΟΘΡΕΨΑΣ**, another very usual formula had been adopted, namely, *μνείας χάριν*, the chances are that the engraver would have bequeathed to us the following, **ΜΝΕΙΑΧΑΡΙΝ . ΘΗΛΥΜΙΤΡΗC**.

It follows from this view, that we must resort to some other mode of restoring its lost syllables to **ΤΙΑΣ** than that mentioned above: to such I shall shortly have occasion to direct the attention of my audience.

I now pass from the consideration of *Αττικός*, with reference to its import in the inscription, to a discussion which concerns the individual whom it designated, respecting whose identity SMITH has proposed a very remarkable hypothesis. It will be recollected that he had subsided into the conviction, that its true sense is the Onomastic, at which point, if he had paused, I should have had nothing further to impugn: but he ventured a step beyond that, and beguiled, perhaps, by the hope of connecting this marble with an illustrious name, hastened to the conclusion, that its donor was one of the two celebrated personages whom I have recently had occasion to mention, Tiberius Claudius Attikós, the father, and Tiberius Claudius Attikós Heródes, the son.* It is true, that at the conclusion of his Postscript he has hinted a change of opinion on this point also; but as he has advanced no reasons for either forming or abandoning it, it may not be improper to test its soundness more satisfactorily, were it only for the historical interest with which the discussion will be sure to invest our subject. The fixed chronological position, moreover, which this monument would assume by the verification of SMITH's conjecture, is a circumstance which I cannot regard but with some feeling of satisfaction, as I have

* Vid. Proceedings, ubi sup. p. 52.

myself arrived at the conclusion, on evidence to be stated more explicitly hereafter, that he erred not widely from the truth in referring it, in a general way, to a date included within the periods of Hadrian and his immediate successors.

It is evident from the manner in which SMITH expresses himself on this subject, that he had at first hesitated in his choice, as he commences with a detail of some of the prominent incidents in the lives of both Attikoí; but farther on, for reasons which he does not explain, he appears to have narrowed his choice by overruling the claims of Heródes. His words are: "But I thinke to the father, rather than the son, the Atticus in the inscription is to bee ascribed." As, however, the grounds of argument which I mean to propose apply equally to both, I have forborne to avail myself of this restriction; feeling also persuaded, that the more extended investigation will prove the more satisfactory to my audience. There are other grounds, indeed, on which I might take my stand for abridging this discussion, which are, the grave difficulties that beset the advocate of any such identifications at the very threshold of his argument. He must proceed, in effect, on the probability of two distinguished Greek-Roman functionaries, one of whom was admitted even to the honour of the consulship,* sanctioning the suppression on a public monument, firstly of their Roman names; secondly, of their paternal; thirdly, of their ethnic; and fourthly, of all mention of the particular commission with which either stood charged at the period when it was erected. The extreme improbability of all this is so obvious, even from my recent details on the subject of Græco-Roman designations, that I might, perhaps, be warranted in dismissing these identifications as incongruous, and not entitled to farther notice. Yet, as I feel it incumbent on me to pursue the system which I have hitherto observed, namely, of sustaining whatever views I entertain by authentic proofs, I must solicit attention for a few moments, which I shall employ in exposing still more clearly the improbability to which I have referred. Here I trust that I shall obtain credit for my being duly influenced by the maxim of the ancient satirist;† understood, however, in its better sense:

" Scire est nescire, nisi id me
Scire alius scierit."

* Viz. in conjunction with Bellicius Torquatus, U. C. 896., the sixth year of Antoninus Pius.

† Lucilius. See the Vet. Gloss. on Persius, l. 27.

I proceed, therefore, to examine in relation to this question the evidence supplied by marbles, as it fortunately so happens that epigraphic notices respecting the Attikoí of Hadrian and the Antonini have reached our times, which will materially aid us in forming our judgments.

I commence with the senior Attikós, whom we have already seen commemorated and described in an inscription which the traveller CHANDLER copied in the Athenian Olympíeion.* The terms of this description, besides being in accordance with the usual formula, were exceedingly appropriate to the circumstances under which they were inscribed on the marble, this having been the pedestal of a statue erected in honour of his Imperial Patron. As already remarked by me, his full Roman designation has been given. I observe now in addition, that the formulæ of subscription ΕΠΙ Κ. Τ. Λ. was that which appertained to the Epónymoi, and that thus the year in which the statue had been inaugurated was defined.

The next titulus† which I shall cite was in its spirit and intent a counterpart of the foregoing, and concludes, with an unimportant difference, in the same manner. It claims, however, a more special consideration, by reason of the style by which the individual is described in it, to whom the State he represented had confided the execution of an important trust. The authorities of Thásos had deputed him, in quality of their Legate to Athens.... very probably during one of Hadrian's visits there.... with instructions to pay the Emperor the very signal compliment with which the titulus acquaints us. This it does in the following terms: ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΑ . ΑΔΡΙΑΝΟΝ . ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΝ . ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝ . ΘΑΣΙΟΙ . ΔΙΑ . ΠΡΕΣΒΕΥΤΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΤΕΧΝΕΙΤΟΥ . ΞΕΝΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ . ΤΟΥ . ΧΑΡΗΤΟΣ . ΕΠΙ . ΙΕΡΕΩΣ . ΚΑ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΥ. The Claudius Attikós mentioned here in the clause of subscription was the same person with the Epónymos of the preceding titulus; but his Prænomen is in the present instance left out as non-essential, that is, serving no purpose as a distinctive appellation. We observe also that Xenóphantos, the sculptor of the statue in Hadrian's honour, is described as Legate (Πρεσβευτής) and Artist (Τεχνεΐτης), his Official and Professional titles. It is proper that we should bear in mind this instance ... one of a multitude which we might adduce ... of the scrupulous observance by the Greeks of official phraseology.

* Vide *supra*, p. 122.

† Chandler, *Inscr. P. II.* n. 41. p. 57.

I now pass to the notices which we possess relative to Heródes, the son. A record of him has been published by CHANDLER,* acquainting us with the erection of a statue in his honour by the Athenian phylé Antiochís, in the following terms: ΤΟΝ . ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΑ . ΤΩΝ . ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΝ . ΤΙΒ . ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΝ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΝ . ΗΡΩΔΗΝ . ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΝ . Η . ΑΝΤΙΟΧΙΣ . ΦΥΛΗ . ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ. Here his full name and his Demotic constitute his description, whilst the following, which FOURMONT† copied from an altar that Heródes had dedicated to Athéne, or, as he somewhat pompously wrote it, “Athenaía,” designates him by the last of these, preceded by his Greek agnomen (*ἐπωνύμιον*), and the Greek paternal, as usual, in the second case; ΗΡΩΔΗΣ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΥ . ΜΑΡΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ. This was an Athenian monument, and therefore we may conjecture that the choice of the Greek components may be accounted for by the relation in which the goddess for whom the offering was designed stood towards Athens; so that the taste of the rhetorician may have suggested the briefer formule in preference to the more prolix, Τιβέριος Κλαυδίου Ἀττικὸς Ἀττικοῦ Ἡρώδης Μαραθώνιος, the ostentation of which would have less consisted with the sacredness of a votive.

We may observe here, incidentally, that this completer form of description explains at once the order which has been adopted in the Epitaph cited by Philóstratos:‡

Ἀττικοῦ Ἡρώδης Μαραθώνιος, οὗ τάδε πάντα
Κεῖται τῷδε τάφῳ, πάντοθεν εὐδόκιμος.

The writer has not inverted here the legitimate sequence of the proper names in order, as might be supposed, to satisfy the exigencies of the Hexameter, but merely retrenched the first half of the full designation, as given above.

An observation by SMITH may also be noticed here:§ “This Atticus----- was the father of *Herodes Atticus*, as hee is commonly called by the Roman writers, as if it were the name of the familye: whereas it should bee more properly *Herodes Attici*, viz., *filius*, etc.” This requires correction; the Roman designation was solely an inversion of the proper order of the Greek names, Ἀττικὸς Ἡρώδης, or perhaps the “Atticus” therein was an Ethnic, and

* Inscr. P. II. n. 40.

‡ P. 566. Edit. Olear. 1709.

† Ap. Böckh. C. I. I. p. 473. n. 490.

§ Proceedings R. I. A., ubi supra.

intended to convey the sense of "Herodes ille Atticus," as Statius* speaks of Pheidias, "Atticus Elæi senior," etc.

To return to our immediate subject. The records of the Attikoí given above have all been transcribed from Athenian monuments: but it may be proper, in order to complete this evidence, to produce a few notices concerning Heródes from those of the Asiatic Greeks, amongst whom he is known to have held high official rank. The sites of Éphesos, Smýrna, and, perhaps, Alexándreia Troás, supply us with these. A fragment of a pedestal which had once supported a statue erected in his honour is still visible amongst the ruins of the aqueduct that form so conspicuous a feature underneath the hill of the Ephesian Akrópolis. It bears the inscription ΚΛ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΝ . ΗΡΩΔΗΝ,† which in all probability had been preceded by ΤΙ (Τιβέριον) in the perfect state of the marble. A record of him has also been preserved in a mutilated Smyrnæan titulus, of which SMITH‡ has given us about one-half in his Survey of the Apocalyptic Churches, the portion that relates to Heródes appearing as follows; ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΥ . ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΥ . ΗΡΩ - - - -, that is, 'Ηρώδου, which we may presume to have been followed in the perfect marble by one or more titles, for, immediately after the blank space, we read, ΚΑΙ . ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ . ΚΑΙ - - - - - ΘΕΑΣ . ΡΩΜΗΣ, the void space here having very probably contained ΙΕΡΕΩΣ in connexion with what immediately follows. A few observations may here be acceptable, in consideration of the historical interest of this titulus, which unquestionably contained in its more perfect state a notice of the extraordinary magistracy that had been conferred upon Heródes by the Emperor Hadrian. This was, the Presidency of the Autonomous cities of the proconsular Asia, to which Philóstratos§ has referred in the following passage: 'Ηρχε μὲν γὰρ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐλευθέρων πόλεων ὁ Ἡρώδης. According to this view Böckh has restored the first six lines as follows: "Ἐδοξεν τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἐλ-

* Silv. i. l. 102.

† Vide Böckh, C. I. ii. p. 611. n. 2978.

‡ Notit. Sept. As. Eccles. pp. 56. s. Compare Böckh, ii. p. 731. n. 3187.

§ P. 548. Ed. Olear. 1709. Comp. Dobson. Oratt. Attic. vol. iv. p. 565. not. 4. This mission of Heródes was similar to that of Maximus, to whom we find Plinius Secundus addressing one of his letters (Epist. viii. 24.) on the subject of the conduct of his government, viz. the regulation ("ordinatio") of the Free Cities of Achaía. Accordingly, the jurisdiction which appertained to it was subordinate to that of the Proconsul.

λῆσιν* (the Greeks of the free states) — — Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Ἡρώδου — — — καὶ σεβαστοφάντου, καὶ — — — ἱερέως θεᾶς Ῥώμης, καὶ θεοῦ Καίσαρος (Hadrian) — — Διὸς πατρῶν, Αὐτοκράτορος, Ἀρχιερέως Μεγίστου, Πατὴρ τῆς Πατρίδος κ. τ. λ. Here, before Τιβερίου there most certainly existed some notice of Heródes in his official capacity, by virtue of which he must be supposed to have presided in the Convention of the Representatives of the States. His other titles, which are extant in the inscription, corresponded to this: for example; Σεβαστοφάντης, one of the highest sacerdotal dignity, and second only to the Pontificate, which was the prerogative of the Cæsars. Böckh explains the meaning of this term by comparing it with Ἱεροφάντης: “Σεβαστοφάντης est ut Ἱεροφάντης.” We know that the priests of this order amongst the Egyptians and Greeks were the “Antistites Sacrorum,” interpreters of all that related to the Rites and Ceremonies of their religious systems:† and consequently the Sebastophants stood in the same relation during the Græco-Roman times to the deified Augusti.

The memorial of Heródes which has been preserved at Alexándreia Troás, was first published by Pococke,† but in a form so exceedingly imperfect as to baffle the experience and sagacity of Böckh in his attempt at restoring it. The first two lines appear thus: Ι. ΚΥ. . . ΟΝ = ΤΙΚ. . . . ΤΙΚΟΝ, which he has proposed to read, ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΝ . ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΝ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΝ, thus inverting the positions of the Roman names, an inobservance of order scarcely compatible with the fidelity of a public monument. Perhaps, therefore, the better course would be to confine our attempt to the second line, which contains all the requisite elements, so far as it goes, correctly represented, and read this as follows; ΤΙ . ΚΛ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΝ, which we are at liberty to suppose had been followed by ΗΡΩΔΗΝ. If now we pass to the eleventh and twelfth lines, we read thus: ΧΙΕΡΕ . . . ΕΑΣΟΛΥΜ = ΙΑΔΟΣΑ . . . ΟΝΗΡΩΑ, and these may be probably restored to ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΑ . ΘΕΑΣ . ΟΛΥΜΠΙΑΔΟΣ . ΚΛ . ΑΤ ΤΙΚΟΝ . ΗΡΩΔΗΝ. These restorations consist with the statement of Philóstratos respecting the kind offices of Heródes on behalf of the citizens of Troás:‡ ἰδὼν δὲ τὴν Τρωάδα βαλανείων τε πονηρῶς ἔχουσιν κ. τ. λ. ἐπέστειλεν Ἀδριανῶ, τῷ

* Vide Tertullian. adv. Marcion. i. 13. On the office of the Ἱεροφάντης amongst the Athenians, see Potter, ii. ch. 20. under the head ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΑ.

† Inscr. Ant. i. 3. p. 40. n. 1. Böckh, tom. ii. p. 873. n. 3579.

‡ Ubi supra, p. 548.

αὐτοκράτορι, μὴ περιιδεῖν πόλιν ἀρχαίαν καὶ εὐθάλαττον κ. τ. λ., which was followed by the construction of an aqueduct, during the progress of which he was largely aided by his father from his private funds. Perhaps the first of the above-cited lines of Pococke's fragment may admit of a restoration illustrating this fact, namely **ΤΙ . ΚΑ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΝ**.

It appears to me that these citations respecting the Attikoί of Hadrian and his successors dispose satisfactorily of SMITH's proposed identifications, whether we regard them simply as Græco-Roman, or include also a consideration of their official rank. Had it been the elder Attikós who was the donor of this anaglyph, I feel confident that he would not have failed to describe himself in his capacity of Imperial Commissioner to the Autonomous cities of Asia, and the same may be predicated of Heródes, in his quality of their President. Thus we have seen the Thasian Legate, Xenóphantos, described in a titulus lately cited* in his twofold capacity of Ambassador and Artist; and in a Thyatirene monument,† which I adduce in evidence on account of one of the names with which it concludes, I find recorded an honour awarded to a successful pancratiast by the youths of certain gymnásia, on the occasion of a certain solemnity, the whole concluding with a formal notice of the person who had been chosen to preside, in the following terms: **ΥΠΟ . ΕΠΙΣΤΑΤΗΝ . ΑΥΡ . ΑΤΤΙΚΟΝ . ΖΩΣΙΜΟΥ**. Now, it is difficult to conceive that officials of the Augusti of such conspicuous rank as the Attikoί would be less conscious of the opportunities they possessed of proclaiming their distinctions than the Legate of an Ægean community, or an agonistic president in a provincial city, even though the titulus of Smýrna so recently cited did not supply us with a direct proof of the reverse.

SMITH's final conjecture relates to the fragment **ΤΙΑΣ** in the commencement of the second line, and is but an extension of the hypotheses which we have just now been examining. His words are, after his ascription of the **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ** before us to the father of Heródes,‡ "how hee comes to be called 'Hippitias' or 'Hippotias,' if that be his prenomén, or whether 'Hippatias,' or whatever it should be, be the proper name of the person who put up the monument, and Atticus of his country, I have not time nor leisure to enquire."

* Supr. p. 126.

† Vide Böckh, T. II. 836. n. 3503.

‡ Proceedings R. I. A., ubi supra.

Two suppositions are here ventured; the first, that the father of Heródes was named "Hippitías Attikós," which is quite inconsistent with the evidence of marbles; and the second, that **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ** is an Ethnic noun. This acceptance has been examined at such length already, that it is unnecessary for me to make it the subject of any further observations. It will be recollected also, that to receive **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ** in its legitimate sense, the Onomastic, and at the same time suppose that **ΤΙΑΣ** had formed, in the perfect state of the epigraph, a part of any Greek proper name, would be equivalent to the admission of two contradictory propositions. It remains, therefore, that I should propose some other less exceptionable mode of recovering the word of which this fragment was the termination, and that the intent of the donor of this anaglyph enables me to effect this I entertain no doubt.

I have already expressed my belief, in the earlier part of this section, that the marble before us was a Charisterial offering,* a public tribute of honour suggested by feelings of gratitude. The Sentiment, therefore, or *Εὐχαριστία*, which, in one of the examples that I cited from marbles,† replaces, as a synonym, the more usual *Εὐχαριστήριον*, at once suggests itself for our adoption. Accordingly, I venture to propose *Εὐχαριστίας*. But this, in its turn, demands another supplement to stand in regimen with it, a requirement which would be at once satisfied by either *ἔνεκεν* or *χάριν*, agreeably with the common formule, were it not for the almost invariable practice observed in tituli of placing these after, not before, the noun with which they are constructed. This obstacle being insurmountable, I next sought a term which might serve the double purpose of governing *εὐχαριστίας*, and standing as an Appositive to the Predicate case of the subauded verb *ἀνέθηκε*; and such a one immediately suggested itself in *Μνημεῖον*, the application of which by Heródotos, in a passage that I formerly cited from him,‡ appears perfectly germane to the case before us. I felt myself, however, on reflection, constrained to reject this also, in consequence of its almost universal meaning in epigraphic Greek, "sepulchral monument." I then made choice of its synonym *Ῥύπονημα*, on finding it exempt from any such restriction in its use, and thus completed the second line in a form which, without any farther advocacy on my part, I may leave to plead its own cause.

* Vide pp. 109. ss.

† Supr. p. 111.

‡ Supr. p. 116.

I cannot, however, refrain from strengthening my position by the following citation from a Teïan inscription, in which the self-same expression that I have selected occurs in a lacuna restored by the learned Böckh: * "Ἴνα εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον ὑπομνήματα (" memorials") ἡ Κράτωνι τε τῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείας, καὶ τῇ Συνόδῳ τῆς εὐχαριστίας.

We have now advanced a very considerable length of way towards unravelling the intricacies of our inquiry. The sole remaining difficulty with which we have now to contend is what we may term the Appropriation of this anaglyph; in other words, the specific Predicate of ἀνέθηκε. But firstly, as conducive to clearness, let us for a moment review the steps by which we have arrived at our present position.

Our primary object was to ascertain the class of this monument with reference to the motive of its donor: and we have brought forward reasons founded on trustworthy data for considering it as an "Eucharistérion," that is, an Offering or Gift expressive of grateful sentiments.† We then found that ΝΕΑΝ . ΠΟΛΙΝ, in the first line of the epigraph, admits of two very distinct senses, one of which requires the presence of the preposition ΕΙΣ before it, whilst the other connects it as an Appositive with the predicate noun of ἀνέθηκε; as also, that the last of these may be either expressed or understood.‡ We then considered ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ, which closes the second line, in reference to the rival probabilities of its having been used there in its Onomastical or Ethnical import, and arrived at the conclusion, that so strong a presumption exists in favour of the former of these that the latter must yield place to it as a basis of restoration.§ Under this head were included the two following results: the first, that ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ appeared singly on the stéle, and unconnected with any Name or Fore-name: || the second, that the individual who bore it, and who presented the anaglyph, was not known to history as identified with either of the Attikoί who rose to such eminence under the auspices of Hadrian and the Antonini.**

We now combine these results with the restorations of the second line which have been just now proposed: we represent also the Predicate case of ἀνέθηκε

* C. I. II. p. 655. n. 3067. ll. 31. 34.

† Supr. pp. 88. 111. 116.

** Supr. pp. 124. ss.

§ Supr. pp. 116. ss.

† Supr. pp. 109. ss.

|| Supr. pp. 123. s.

by τὸ ἀγαλμα in accordance with the **TON . ΑΝΔΡΙΑΝΤΑ** of the Xanthian inscription cited in the course of this section,* and offer the following as synopses of the present state of our knowledge respecting the epigraph before us :

- a. Τὸ Ἄγαλμα εἰς τὴν νέαν Μυησίων πόλιν, b. Τὸ Ἄγαλμα, τὴν νέαν Μυησίων πόλιν,
 'Υπόμνημα τῆς εὐχαριστίας' Ἀττικός. 'Υπόμνημα εὐχαριστίας' Ἀττικός.

We have thus succeeded in narrowing by one-half the area of uncertainty, and by this mean disembarassing essentially the remainder of our inquiry. The double form of restoration here proposed results from the doubt which as yet exists respecting the sense in which **NEAN. ΠΟΛΙΝ** is to be received: and had that in the case of **ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ** remained unremoved, we should have had, for each of these, two distinct forms, thus incumbering the future discussion with four distinct resultants.

I now address myself to the consideration of my fourth general head of inquiry, as stated in the commencement of this Section;† in other words, to the defining the substitute with which we are to replace the indeterminate Ἄγαλμα in the first of the forms of restoration as specified above. It is quite obvious that a determinate answer to this question will exhibit itself in a determinate resultant, either merging in the second form, or superseding it altogether. Should such success attend our investigation, our position with regard to the anaglyph before us would resemble that which we occupy in relation to its associate; in a degree, at least; for the evidence of our possessing in the latter what the *Εἰκὼν γραπτὴ* was in the sister art is precise, and what may be termed, in a certain sense, ocular, as the epigraph containing the information has reached us in its original state; whereas, no amount of research could ever effect the same for the sculpture of Attikós, because we are precluded from ever rising above the level of probabilities by the condition in which its epigraph has descended to us. I speak, however, now in a strictly logical sense: as I hope, ere I conclude, to make it appear that the probabilities at our disposal are so materially enhanced by coincidences as to claim our assent on all reasonable grounds of evidence.

It will be recollected that I have already expressed a decided opinion,

* Supr. p. 111.

† Supr. p. 109.

stating at the same time my reasons for having formed it, that the sculpture of Attikós was a public monument,* and consequently, that the individual represented therein must have been one who stood upon a higher level than the Lysimáche of its associate. We must, therefore, search for her either in the religion of the Myesian state, as its Tutelary, or in Myth, as its Foundress, or in Allegory, as the Impersonation of the Community, or in the person of some actual historical individual, who was enabled from her position to influence its weal. I can form no conception of any Archetype having been present to the sculptor's mind which may not be referred to one or other of these. I now proceed to discuss their several pretensions to our acceptance with reference (for a reason which will shortly appear) to the Ionian confederation in particular, and hope by this method to limit very considerably the extent of our uncertainty, supposing even the worst, that I fail of influencing more decidedly your convictions.

I commence, in the order stated above, with Tutelaries; a most comprehensive and interesting class of representations on the monuments of antiquity, more especially the Numismatic, to which, as in general the most accessible, and offering the amplest illustrations of my subject, I propose to confine my attention.

Every student in this department is familiar with the effigies of Pallás, and her concomitant symbols, the Owl and Olive, on the coins of the city of Kékrops: and, to come nearer to our present site, that of the Myesian town, with the goddess so frequently associated in tutelary care with the Sipylene Mother, the winged Neméseis, on the coins of Smýrna:† with the Ártemis Polýmastos, attended in her character of Huntress by the Stag, and in that of Archegétis or chief Foundress, by the Bee, on the coins of Éphesos:‡ with the Consort of Zeús and her symbolical bird, or in her capacity of Pronuba (*νυμφεύτρια*), as designated by the Lunar crescent, on those of Sámos:§ with the effigies of Heraklês, the Tutelary of Erythraí, on the coins of that city, and his accessories, the Hide of the Nemeian lion, the Club, the Bow, and the Quiver:‖ with the Ártemis Leukophryené of the Mæandrian Magnesiá.** Thus Lébedos had

* Supr. p. 511. Comp. pp. 112. ss.

† Ibid. p. 512. b.

‖ Ibid. pp. 522. s. Comp. Pausan. vii. 5. 3.

† Vide Eckhel, T. ii. pp. 548. s.

§ Ibid. pp. 568. s.

** Ibid. pp. 525. ss.

its Pallás, and so also Priéne: and it is scarcely necessary to add, that Téos owed its rank as a sacred and inviolable site to the tutelary guardianship of Diónysos.*

These are records of the honours paid to divine Prostátai which every numismatist's cabinet meriting the title exhibits in abundance: and sculptures still extant in museums contribute their testimony. Even a cursory perusal of that invaluable relic of antiquity, the Hellenic tour of Pausanías, suffices to prove what an exhaustless field the mythical associations of this class disclosed to the artist; how profusely these creations of his genius were scattered over that once favoured territory; with how generous an enthusiasm its inhabitants vied with each other in consecrating his labours to what they esteemed to be their holiest and most dignified employment.

This review cannot be better concluded than with a remark which will be found hereafter eminently useful in the prosecution of our argument. This is, that in consequence of either close neighbourhood or amicable relations (*ὁμόνοια*), it was frequently the custom of cities to interchange their Tutelaries. Thus Kolophón might seem to have adopted the Prostátēs of Kláros into certain of its Autonomous coins, which exhibit the legend ΠΥΘΙΟΣ on their obverses, whilst in others the peculiar type of the Ephesian Ártemis appears.† Míletos, on the same principle, might seem to have borrowed the Samian type of the Nympheútria,‡ and Sámos itself to have introduced into its coins of Homónoia the Alexandrian type of the veiled Ísis.§ Thus also Metrópolis appropriated the Ephesian,|| and the people of Erythraí that which was so distinctive of Chíos, the Sphínx, in the coins which commemorated their mutual concord.**

As a state, however, may be represented not only in the person of its Tutelary as symbolizing its sustentative energy and the religious element in its economy, but also in that of its Founder (*κτίστης*), as impersonating its nascent civilization, I have recognised the claim of this alternative to consideration; the rather so, as I entertain little doubt of my being enabled to prove satisfactorily, that we now stand on Ionian ground; and it is certain, both from the

* Vide Eckhel, pp. 524. 530. b. 531. s. 533. s. 536. b. 563. a.

† Ibid. p. 512.

‡ Ibid. p. 525. a.

§ Ibid. p. 570. b.

|| Ibid. p. 529. b.

** Ibid. pp. 523. b. 566. b.

authority of contemporary writers and their own monuments, that it was a characteristic of the Ionian mind, not to term it a weakness, to trace the origins of their cities to fabulous times and the agencies of mythical personages. It is thus that we find Éphesos, Erythraí, Téos, Klazomené, Smýrna, Phokaía, claiming Amazons as the Foundresses of their respective communities:* nor, indeed, did the Ionians stand alone in their pretensions: as we find the States of Kýme, Mýrhina, Têmnos, and Trípolis, in the contiguous territories of Aiólís and Karia, asserting a like origin.†

* Vide Eckhel, pp. 510. b. 516. b. 523. b. 534. a. 544. 563.

† Ibid. pp. 492. b. 496. a. 497. a. 593. b.

The mention of this community of the Amazons is almost universal amongst ancient authors. Strabo speaks of them several times; ex. gr. in their proper seat, xi. 8., in Mysia, xii. 8., in Ionía, xiv. 1. Stéphanos, in their locality near the Thermódon, in Aiólís, and Ionía: Pausanías distinctly states the persuasion that they were the first foundresses of the temple of the Ephesian Ártemis, and the dedicators of her statue: Diódoros has given a summary of their history from their origin to their decline, in ii. 44. ss. So also Justin, ii. 4., with whose narrative the reader may compare Heródotos, iv. 110. ss.; Orosius, i. 15.; Eustáthios in Dionýs. Perieget. 828.; and Ammianus, xxii. 8. Pliny, v. 31. 4, 7., ascribes to Amazons the foundation of Éphesos and Smýrna: with respect to the former, Tacitus, in Annal. iii. 61., repeats the same tradition with Pausanías mentioned above; and Mela's words are, under the head "Ionía," in i. 17., "Ibi Ephesus, et Dianæ clarissimum templum, quod Amazones, Asia potitæ, consecrassæ traduntur."

These authorities, which might be increased beyond any reasonable limits, induce a belief that the existence of the Amazonian state was something more than a myth. Strabo, indeed, was a sceptic in this particular, and Eustáthios repeats his words in one of his notes on Iliad. d. *Περὶ δὲ τῶν Ἀμαζόνων τὰ αὐτὰ λέγεται, καὶ νῦν, καὶ πάλαι, τερατώδη τ' ὄντα, καὶ πίστεως πόρρω. Τίς γὰρ ἂν πιστεύσειεν, ὡς γυναικῶν στρατὸς, ἡ πόλις, ἡ ἔθνος συσταίη ἂν ποτε χωρὶς ἀνδρῶν; κ. τ. λ.* Whether the sentence in Hippokrátes, which immediately follows the one cited in p. 141. offers a plausible answer to this, I leave it to my readers to judge: *μάχονται τοῖς πολεμοῖς ἕως ἂν παρθέναι εἴωσι. Οὐκ ἀποπαρβενεύονται δὲ μέχρις ἂν τῶν πολεμίων τρεῖς ἀποκτείνωσι.* Plato, at least, expresses his belief in the existence of these female warriors, in the person of one of the speakers in his Treatise "De Legibus," vii. pp. 804. e. s. *Οἶδα ὅτι μυριάδες ἀναριθμητοὶ γυναικῶν εἰσι τῶν περὶ τὸν Πόντον, ἃς Σαυρομάτιδας καλοῦσιν, αἷς οὐχ ἵππων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τόξων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅπλων κοινωνία καὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἴση προσεταγμένη ἴσως ἀσκέεται.*

That fiction has, however, been superadded to truth in these details, I entertain no doubt. Thus we meet very generally with the "exsecta mamma" of Virgil (*Æneid.* l.) in the accounts given of Amazonian customs. The origin of this most probably was to impart an air of plausibility to the favourite Greek etymon for Ἀμαζών, than which nothing could be more preposterous. May we not rather regard it as separable into the components *αμα*, *ζων*, which so nearly represent the

Now, all this may have been founded on something real, or, as the dispassionate critic in such questions may be disposed to conclude, on pure vanity; but the determination of the matter, even granting it to be possible, is by no means necessary on the present occasion, as all we are concerned with is the fact that the persuasion had fixed itself deeply in the mind; had become, in effect, a Faith, and had, accordingly, found its expression in the traditions and monuments of the Asiatic Greeks.

I may be permitted to state a fact within my own experience, which attests the permanence of this conviction even to the present day. It occurred to me whilst in Smýrna, the only one of those cities which can be said to have retained even the shadow of its ancient grandeur. During one of my walks within the precincts of Págos and its Akrópolis, a colossal bust, which had been stationed in a recess to the right of the western portal, at a considerable elevation, attracted my attention. I saw at once, from the pure white colour and fine grain of the marble, still more from the vestiges of artistic skill which yet remained upon it, that I confronted a relic of better days, when Smýrna was still a Neocore, and its citizens the Princes of Asia. But how identify it? The epigraph, if one ever existed, had wholly disappeared from its base. Yet the Smyrnæan of the present day feels, as I very soon learned, at no loss for a solution of this mystery. He recognises, in the full assurance of a traditionary faith, the effigies of the Amazonian foundress of the ancient city still occupying the position which the brother-in-law of Aléxios had assigned her, as though to keep "watch and ward" over her ancient dominion with a Tutelary's care.

Such are my grounds for entertaining this hypothesis in reference to the Ionian city from whence this anaglyph came. It must, however, be confessed, that the scanty notices which we possess with regard to it afford us no data whatsoever for presuming that its Myesian founders had adopted this pretension of their other Ionian compatriots. The evidence supplied by its one or two coins, which will shortly pass under our review, does not bear upon the subject; neither do those ancient geographers who have noticed either the Myesian site,

Persian *همه زن*, words that doubtless existed in the ancient Zend, and express the "purely feminine" character of the community? This, perhaps, is preferable also to the Majyar origin of the term, which WESSELING cites in one of his notes on Diódoros II. 45. from Otrókoxi.

or the more recent city, introduce any allusion to any myth of the kind. Thus, the probability of its having obtained credence amongst the Myesians rests on analogy alone, yet one which itself reposes on so broad a basis as to entitle an hypothesis built upon it to somewhat more than an incidental notice.

From considering this sculpture as the representative of the Myesian state in a sense in which the Religious element appears prominent, as also in its rudimentary condition, as symbolized by a supposed mythical Foundress, I proceed now to view it as embodying the attributes of a community, the polity of which has been fully matured. This, it will be recollected, was the third of the hypotheses enumerated above as entitled to our consideration, and my reason for allowing it a place will appear from the following review of the coins of the Ionian confederacy, selected with reference to this practice.

ECKHEL has headed this list with a Græco-Roman coin of Apollonía, on the obverse side of which appears an impersonation of the Roman Senate, as clearly defined by the epigraph accompanying it, **ΙΕΡΑ . ΣΥΝΚΛΗΤΟΣ**.* The reverse exhibits a female head, attended by no definite attribute, but which, by a parity of reasoning, I conceive myself authorized to regard as personifying the community, it being accompanied by the Ethnic **ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΕΩΝ**. In a similar coin of Klazomené,† the same evidence of political subjection meets us on the obverse, but this is balanced on the reverse by the type of "the standing Fortune," attended by an epigraph, the components of which are the Ethnic and the name of the Eponymous magistrate. Here a distinction is to be noticed. This type, received in connexion with the Ethnic, forms the legend, **ΤΥΧΗ . ΚΛΑΖΟΜΕΝΙΩΝ**, and thus is to be understood as symbolizing the State's prosperity; but no sculpture of it could ever be taken as representing the Community in the same sense with the juvenile head just noticed on the coin of Apollonía; that is, we could not with propriety say, *Ἡ Τύχη, ἡ τῶν Κλαζομενίων πόλις*, whereas, in the former, *Τὸ ἄγαλμα, ἡ τῶν Ἀπολλωνιέων πόλις* would be perfectly intelligible. We are enabled indeed to exemplify this from the Klazomenian coins themselves, two autonomes of the city having been included by ECKHEL in his enumeration,‡ each presenting a female head on its obverse, unaccompanied, it is true, with any epigraph, but not easily referrible to any

* Vide Eckhel. T. II. p. 509. a.

† Ibid. p. 511. a.

‡ Ibid. p. 510. b.

subject excepting that which the reverses indicate, the Klazomenian community itself. This seems more especially manifest in one of the impersonations, the head of which is circled by the laurel wreath, the emblem of victorious energy.

Kolophón,* in like manner, exhibits the female head with the legend transferred to the reverse: and so also Miletos.† The obverses here are without legends (*ἀνενίγραφα*); but the same may be observed in the case of the Apóllon Didymeús in all the autonomes enumerated by ECKHEL. I refer also to the same class of type-representatives the three laureated female heads which he leaves undescribed amongst the autonomes of Smýrna.‡

The islands of Ionia offer but little in illustration of this usage. In the coins of Homónoia, of Chíos, and Erythraí,§ we observe two entirely different type-representatives chosen by the former; one, in accordance with the general custom, the female head, with the epigraph ΔΗΜΟC.ΧΙΩΝ on the same area, the other, the winged Sphínx, which is her constant symbol on her coins of every age. The representative of Erythraí in both is the same, namely, Heraklès the Archegétes. The autonome which PELLERIN has attributed to Ikaría,|| with the female head on its obverse, is in all likelihood an illustration: but this ascription of the coin seems involved in doubt. Pátmos reckons amongst its coins an autonome, with a youth's head encircled with an ivy-wreath,** which accords very well with the Dióte on the reverse. This also appears to exemplify the usage of which I treat.

On the whole it seems abundantly established, notwithstanding that there appear certain remarkable deviations from it, as has been instanced just now by the Chians choosing the Sphínx to symbolize their State, the presence of which in all their coins, of whatever age, precludes the supposition that it had been due to the ascendancy of the Lagídai. Yet, that it was of Egyptian origin no one can doubt who considers the relation in which it stood to the Pharaohs.††

* Vide Eckhel, p. 511. b.

† Ibid. p. 530. b.

‡ Ibid. pp. 539. 545. a. Compare his remarks on the opinions of MEAD and WISE respecting the first two of these coins in pp. 550. s.

§ Ibid. pp. 523. s.

|| Ibid. p. 567. b.

** Ibid.

†† Vide Sir Gardiner Wilkinson's *Work on the Ancient Egyptians*, vol. v. pp. 200. ss.

Again, that the Erythræans chose to be represented on the same occasion by their Tutelary might be accounted for, by supposing that the religion of the State was more or less concerned in the forming and ratifying such alliances.

Other examples, however, occur. The people of Smýrna is represented in a coin of Homónoia between it and the Asians of Lydíā by its Amazonian foundress, whilst the latter are impersonated by a turret-crowned female figure, probably selected under the influence of a similar mythical belief.* Again, the Phokæans are described in one of their autonomes,† probably a coin of Homónoia like the preceding, under the person of their mythical Amazón, associated with Cybéle, who, on the other hand, impersonates the State of Metrópolis. But these are exceptional cases, for which it is by no means difficult to offer very plausible reasons. They cannot, therefore, be justly regarded as affecting the essential truth of our conclusion, that it was a very general practice amongst the Ionians to symbolize their several communities by juvenile heads of either sex, the manifest intent having been to picture to the eye the youth of those communities; in other words, their season of active energy, their prime; the period intervening between a crude civilization and the decline of all influence and power.

The important question which we are now called upon to answer is, Are we to receive the sculpture of Attikós as an example of this usage? In other words, Are we to adopt the second form of restoration of its epigraph which I have proposed, in preference to the first? The following is my reply.

I esteem it as most certain, that priority of reception is due to it as compared with the hypothesis of the anaglyph's representing a supposed mythical Foundress of the Myesian city: for this involves a twofold assumption; firstly, that the citizens of that State had participated in the traditionary belief of their countrymen; secondly, that supposing even the truth of this, the occasion was such as to sanction a departure from the more general form of symbolization. Now of this occasion we know absolutely nothing, nor did the epigraph, I am persuaded, in its original state, convey any information on the subject. I shall, therefore, address myself to the first of these assumptions, as quite sufficient of itself to guide us out of this labyrinth.

* Vide Eckhel, vol. ii. p. 562. a.

† Ibid. p. 534.

I have already observed, that Analogy is the only ground on which we can rest this attribution of an Amazón-foundress to the Myesian town, and therefore, that my entertaining the hypothesis at all was merely subsidiary to the fuller development of my argument. It is most evident, however, that an assumption which is founded on mere Analogy can never sustain a competition with one which is based upon a fact, and that fact a recognised artistic rule. This I state in the general: but now let us examine what I may term the Mythical hypothesis on its own merits, descending to details; for in these it is plain that we must hearken to the dictation of Analogy, if we allow ourselves to be guided by it in the principle.

The details to which I refer here are those of the effigies of mythical Foundresses, with which the medals of the Ionian confederation, as well as of others which I have added to the list, acquaint us, a review of which appears to be decisive of the question, so far, at least, as numismatic evidence extends. We observe the characteristics of these effigies to vary according to the type which the artist was required to follow. This appears to have been twofold. If the Amazón was to be represented in her capacity of Foundress, she then became a Pyrgophóros; the diadem which encircled her head was an emblem of the military defences with which she guarded her infant State. But she was also a member of a warlike community; in which light she makes her appearance as an Hoplophóros; she wields the battle-axe, and the turreted crown is replaced with the helmet. This, however, is the rarer type, the medals of Téos alone of all the Ionic states exhibiting it; and none of those of Aiolís. The type of the Karian Trípolis introduces another warlike element, the Horse, one of very infrequent occurrence, and singularly illustrative of the passage in Hippokrátes* relative to the Amazons: *Τουτέων αἱ γυναῖκες ἰππάζονται τε καὶ τοξέουσι καὶ ἀκοντίζουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἵππων.*

My conclusion from these data is that, unless we are to slight the evidence of medals and coins as expositors of archaic symbols, we must disallow the claims of a mythical Foundress to be considered as impersonated in this anaglyph.

* Vide Hippokrát. "De ær. aq. et loc." cited by Stephanus under the head "Amazones" in "Dict. Hist." p. 86. b. Lloyd. 1693.

I now proceed to examine the comparative pretensions of the first and third hypotheses, that is, whether we are to regard this sculpture as representing a Tutelary, or as symbolizing the Myesian community. A definite reply to this question would enable us to dispense with one of our forms of restoration, and thus advance us an important step towards our proposed end. But I labour at present under the disadvantage of not being as yet in a position to bring forward the full evidence which I regard myself as possessing in behalf of the first of these alternatives, until I submit a few details with which it is materially connected, not the least important of which is the identification of the city commemorated in the epigraph. In the mean time it may be urged in its favour, that the occasions on which divine Prostátai were made the subjects of such offerings as the present so very much outnumber those on which communities were selected for that purpose, that even a simple calculation of chances would go far in deciding the question. The position which they occupied, as the chief objects of worship, and the vehicles of the profoundest sympathies, was so elevated, that they occasionally supplanted, as we have seen,* the allegorical types even in their own proper sphere. We may also, with more immediate reference to the sculpture before us, ask this question: supposing it Charisterial, is it not self-evident that the sentiment which suggested it as such would be more adequately expressed by adopting as its subject the higher impersonation, that is, the Representative of the Religion of the community, than by selecting the lower, namely, the community itself?

So far the claims of the Tutelary might appear to have been paramount; but whether they were recognised on the present occasion must remain an open question until we can form some probable opinion with reference to the inquiry, on which of the female deities who bore sway in Ionia as Prostátides we are at present to fix our regards. It is probable that we may then find the fourth of the alternatives which have been proposed for our consideration most eminently entitled to it, as conducting to a remarkable coincidence, and, through it, to a ready solution of our somewhat perplexing enigma. From henceforth, therefore, my first hypothesis, the Tutelary, and my last, the Historical, go hand-in-hand, as I propose to establish a fact with reference to the former,

* Vide supr. pp. 139. s.

which will so harmonize with an undoubted fact in the case of the latter, that it will enable me to blend the two together, and thus avail myself of their united aid to elicit a definite result. The circumstances which have led to this fusion of hypotheses, which appear at first sight so independent of each other, may be generally explained, and my reasons at the same time assigned for superadding the last of the series. With this intent I observe, that we are now conversant with an era in the annals of the Hellenic states very different from the Autonomous. In all public monuments, including the Numismatic, the effigies of the dominant powers had, during the Græco-Roman period, supplanted in a great measure the indigenous types; and of this altered state of things the anaglyph before us may prove a witness.... a lone representative amongst us of that countless array which, during the ascendancy of Imperial Rome, crowded the edifices of Greece from the temples of its gods to the private abodes of its aristocracy. It will be remembered that I have already hazarded a conjecture, which its external characteristics are such as to render in the highest degree probable, that it was intended as a tribute of respect to a female of illustrious station.* This persuasion was forced upon me by the very first sight which I had of it; I mean, a sight improved and disciplined by a large experience in this department of study. Subsequent meditation and research led me by a gradual progress, a faithful delineation of which has been presented in the pages of this Memoir, to individualize this first impression in the person of a member of an Imperial family, which can be easily proved to have stood high in the estimation of the Hellenic communities, as well by its acts of kind consideration, as by the paramount influence which had been secured to it in consequence of the energy and prosperous career of its Founder. It is evident, that the probability of this identification is materially enhanced by showing that the personage here alluded to had been designated in such a way by the Hellenic states in their public monuments, whether from grateful remembrances or unworthy adulation it matters little at present, as to become directly associated with their religious sympathies in the actual person of a goddess whom, above all, our Tutelary hypothesis would suggest; for thus we have two probabilities, each resting on its peculiar ground, that is, the proba-

* Supr. pp. 112. ss. 133. s.

bility of the Tutelary hypothesis, and that of the Historical, both converging to an identical result, and bound up together, so to express myself, in the same person through the instrumentality of a common name.

I proceed now to submit the course of argument by which I establish all this, first premising the order that I mean to observe. I place foremost my identification of the city styled in the epigraph *ἡ νέα Μυησίων πόλις*, as a point of the highest importance, and which occupied the third place in my general classification of Heads of inquiry at the commencement of this Section. I then address myself to the fourth general Head, namely, the identification of this anaglyph*, to effect which I ascertain, in the first place, what particular deity the Myesian city had either adopted as its Tutelary, or at least might be expected to have venerated as such in virtue of its political connexion. I then define from the evidence supplied by the epigraph itself, so far as is possible, the limit of its age. I remark, in the third place, certain characteristics of the sculpture which tend to confirm this inference, as well as lead us, "primâ facie," to conclude that an individual of exalted rank had been its immediate subject. Lastly, I identify this subject with a well-known historical personage, stating at the same time my reasons for selecting her in particular, and conclude with submitting my final restoration of the epigraph.

SMITH has proposed an identification of the Myesian city, which he might appear to have regarded with some degree of complacency, for he writes concerning it, in his Letter to Primate MARSH, as follows, after referring to a notice by Stéphanos concerning the old Ionian city "Myēs :"—* "Whether Myes bee here meant by *νέα πόλις*, then newly erected into a city, or some other city built by the inhabitants of the former, forced to remove to a more convenient and healthier place, the defect in the beginning, owing to the injury of time after so many ages, will not suffer us to know now, (or?) who it was that did honour to this 'new city' by setting up this monument - - - -. If it bee the same with Myûs, *Μυοῦς*, as is very likely, then it is certaine that it was a maritime city of Ionia, not farre from the river Mæander. of w^e wee have several accounts given by Strabo, Pausanias, and Pliny, not to mention other authors, both Greeke and Latine."

I observe with respect to this, that we are concerned at present with *νέα*

* Vide Proceedings R. I. A., ubi supra, p. 51.

Μυησίων πόλις, not *Μυησίαν πόλις*; that it is the former, not the latter, that we are required to identify with some known geographical site. That the Ionian city “*Myûs*” cannot be that site is very clear, not only from the discrepancy between the Ethnical names, *Μυούσιος* and *Μυήσιος*, but also because it had ceased to exist as a separate state, probably long before the New City of the Myesians was built. The expressions of Pausanías, when writing concerning the Ionic migration to the maritime tracts of Western Asia, appear to be confirmatory of this :* *Μυούντος δὲ οἱ οἰκήτορες ἐπὶ τύχῃ τοιαύτῃ ἐξέλιπον τὴν πόλιν. Κατὰ τὴν Μυουσίαν χώραν θαλάσσης κόλπος ἐσεῖχεν οὐ μέγας· τοῦτον λίμνην ὁ ποταμὸς ἐποίησεν ὁ Μαίανδρος, ἀποτεμόμενος τὸν ἔσπλουν τῇ ἰλύϊ· ὥς δὲ ἐνόστησε τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ οὐκ ἔτι ἦν θάλασσα, κώνωπες ἄπειροι πλῆθος ἐγίγνοντο ἐκ τῆς λίμνης, ἐς ὃ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠνάγκασαν ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν. ἀπεχώρησαν δὲ ἐς Μίλητον Μυούσιοι, τὰ τε ἄλλα ἀγώγιμα καὶ τῶν θεῶν φερόμενοι τὰ ἀγάλματα.* This incorporation of the Myusians with the people of Miletos is quite decisive as to the value of SMITH’s conjecture.

Equally untenable is one which, during the first stage of my inquiry, I had formed respecting this site : that we are to look for it in *Mýa*, an island in the Ceramic gulf,† and probably a dependency of *Halikarnassós*; that our anaglyph, therefore, is of Karian origin. A little reflection, however, convinced me that this supposition could not be entertained; for, not to insist on the extreme insignificance of the place, and its being even questionable whether any town entitled to the designation “*Pólis*” existed therein at all, the form of the Ethnic, *Μυήσιος*, disagrees with the general Karian type, according to which we should have expected either *Μυεύς* or *Μυηνός*, as in the instances of *Μύλασα*, *Λάβρανδα*, etc.

I then addressed myself to Stéphanos, the geographer first referred to by SMITH, but whom he appears to have laid aside, after having been conducted to the very threshold of the truth. He writes thus :‡ *Μύης Μύητος, ὡς Φάγρης Φάγρητος, πόλις Ἰωνική· Ἐκαταῖος Ἀσία· Τὸ Ἐθνικὸν, Μυήσιος, ὡς Φαγρήσιος.* Here we have the name of the parent city, together with the precise Ethnic which occurs in our epigraph; but this is not sufficient. The clause merely informs us that *Μύης* was the same with *ἡ Μυησίαν πόλις*, but leaves us in the dark as to *ἡ νέα Μυησίαν πόλις*. The former of these, however, having been an Ionian city, the probable inference is, that the latter was one also; accord-

* Pausan. vii. 2. 7.

† Plin. v. 36. 3.

‡ “*De Urbibus*,” p. 567. a. Ed. Berkel. 1694.

ingly, I had recourse to Strabo, in whose enumeration of the cities of that territory I perceived the following notice, which immediately appeared to me to supply the information required : * *Εἴτα Νεάπολις, ἡ πρότερον μὲν ἦν Ἐφεσίῳ, νῦν δὲ Σαμίων, διαλλαξαμένων πρὸς τὸ Μαραθήσιον, τὸ ἐγγυτέρω πρὸς τὸ ἀπωτέρω.* It occurred to me that this clause solved the whole difficulty, as nothing was more usual than for Greek authors, when mentioning cities of this name, to disjoin the Abstract from the Concrete, and then allow the latter its separate inflexion. Thus Heródotos, speaking of the Ægyptian Neápolis, has the following sentence : † *Ἔστι δὲ Χέμμις, πόλις μεγάλη Νομοῦ τοῦ Θηβαϊκοῦ ἐγγὺς Νέης Πόλιος.* Again : ‡ *Στρατιὴν παρελάμβανε ἐκ Ποτιδαίης, καὶ Ἀφύτιος, καὶ Νέης Πόλιος,* that is, of Neápolis of Palléne. Thukydides adopts the same separate inflexion ; as for example, when mentioning Neápolis of Zeugitana : § *Παραπλεύσαντες ἐς Νεάν Πόλιν, Καρχηδονιακὸν ἐμπόριον.* So also Diódoros : || *Καὶ πρώτην μὲν ἔλων Νεάν Πόλιν κατὰ κράτος κ. τ. λ.,* in which passage the somewhat too literal version by Rhodomanus should be replaced with "Neapolim."

The inference which results from combining these authorities appears to me to be quite certain ; that *τὴν Νεάν Μυησίων Πόλιν* and *Νεάπολιν τῶν Μυησίων* are designations identical in the reference. We are now, therefore, in a condition to improve our former version, "the New City of the Myesians," by substituting in its place, "Neápolis of the Myesians." Another deduction is, that our Neápolis must have been one and the same with the Ionian Neápolis of Strabo, as Stéphanos has informed us, on the authority of Hekataíos, that Mýes was a city of that region. These are important results, and will be found eminently serviceable in advancing us to the close of our inquiry.

With respect to this ancient city, the forerunner of our Neápolis, we know nothing beyond its mere geographical position. I esteem it, therefore, quite unnecessary to offer any remarks on SMITH's conjectures as to the relation in which our Neápolis stood to it, farther than this : that Mýes may have been

* Strab. xiv. 1. p. 173. Tauchn. In the edition by FALCONER (T. II. p. 916. 15.) the words after *Σαμίων* have been introduced, informing us that the exchange of Neápolis for Marathésion was one of mutual convenience. The site of the latter is unquestionably the modern Scala Nuova ; not Neápolis, as had been generally taken for granted before LEAKE's time. See his "Diary," p. 261. as also Böckh, Lemma to Inscr. 3022.

† Heródot. II. 91. init.

§ B. P. VII. 50.

‡ Ibid. VII. 123. init.

|| Bibl. H. XX. 17.

overturned in one of those convulsions of nature which we know to have devastated at different times the cities of Western Asia, that lay within and contiguous to the range of the Katakekauméne; and that it may have risen again from its ruins under the name of "Neápolis of the Myesians." It appears strange to me, unless we suppose some such identity, that Strabo should have omitted all mention of Mýes, and Stéphanos of Neápolis, in their respective catalogues of the Ionian cities. We may be allowed, moreover, to cite an analogous case, which countenances, so far as it goes, this presumption, namely, that of the Karian Stratoníkeia, which, after its total overthrow by a catastrophe of this kind during the reign of Hadrian, and its reconstruction under the auspices of the Emperor, had its name altered to "Hadrianópolis of the Stratonikeians."

This identification of our Myesian city conducts me to the department of Numismatics to which, as may be recollected, I proposed the rendering a slight service by ascertaining the true import of the words *τὴν νέαν Μυησίων πόλιν*. My meaning was, that Strabo is not our only available authority for the recognition of a Neápolis amongst the Ionic cities, but that I felt confident of our possessing a record of at least two coins, which also attest this fact. Yet, how much involved in doubt this testimony has been may be conceived from ECKHEL's total omission of this site from his Recensus of the Ionic towns in the body of his elaborate work. I trust, however to make it appear that the learned Numismatist either overlooked altogether, or took, at least, but a too partial view of, the evidence in this instance, having been perhaps misled by his want of acquaintance with any Keimélia referrible to the Ionian Neápolis.

In proof of this, I refer in the first place to ECKHEL's account of Makedonian coins, under the head "Neápolis," where mention will be observed of an autonome, the obverse of which exhibits a head of Diónysos, accompanied by a Thýrsos in the rear, whilst the reverse is characterised by a Bótrys, with the epigraph **ΝΕΑΠΟ.*** This coin ECKHEL has assigned, but not without hesitation, to Makedonía, for the following very insufficient reason: "Quia Bacchus in Macedonia et Thracia prævalet." It may, however, in all fairness be asked, Does not the self-same reason hold good in favour of Ionía? Do not the

* Eckhel, ubi supr. II. p. 72. b.

coins of Lébedos and Téos, to mention these in particular, proclaim this, the latter of which was the chosen seat of the Dionysiac worship? Nay, one of its autonomes mentioned by ECKHEL himself, presents on both its obverse and reverse the identical reliefs which characterise this so-called Makedonian coin.* It appears to me that he ought, on every account, to have allowed our Neápolis the benefit of his indecision; the rather so, as COMBE, who had preceded him, and to whom he refers, classes this coin under the head of the Karian Neápolis in his descriptive catalogue of the Hunterian collection.† He has, it is true, assigned no reason for this attribution, and therefore ECKHEL may possibly have regarded it in the light of a vague conjecture; which probably it was, resulting in part from ignorance of our Neápolis as an archæological site, and partly, it may be, from his choosing as his guides such catalogues as those of Pliny and Mela, wherein the Karian Neápolis finds a place,‡ but all mention of the Ionian has been omitted.

I now pass to the second of those coins, from SESTINI's ascription of which to our site ECKHEL has withheld his assent, precisely as he has done in the case which I have just considered.§ Its age is that of Trebonianus, and the type on the reverse is that of the "Standing Fortune," accompanied by the epigraph **ΝΕΑΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ**. We possess, on behalf of the appropriation of this coin to the Ionian Neápolis, precisely the same analogy as before: for we find an Imperial coin of Lébedos of the age of Caracalla, which has been described and figured by ECKHEL himself,|| minted after an exactly corresponding type, with the legend **ΛΕΒΕΔΙΩΝ**. It is plain that the "Fortuna stans" in each of these is the ideagraphic synonyme of **ΤΥΧΗ**, thus forming with the Ethnic nouns, **ΤΥΧΗ . ΝΕΑΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ**, **ΤΥΧΗ . ΛΕΒΕΔΙΩΝ**, and they may be compared with the autonomous **ΤΥΧΗ . ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΩΝ**, which serves as the exégesis of the similar type in the coins of Smýrna.** I may add **ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ . ΤΥΧΗ** in certain of those of Éphesos.††

* See the coins of Lébedos and Téos referred to here, in Eckhel, II. 524. b. 563. a.

† Id. in T. II. 72. b. VIII. Addend. p. 32. a.

‡ Vide Plin. v. 29. 5. Mel. I. 16. p. 25. Bip. Comp. Ptolem. v. 2.

§ Ubi supra, from Sestini's "Lettere e Dissertazioni Numismatiche," etc. v. p. 25.

|| Vide "Num. Anecdote" p. 204. Tab. XII. n. 7.

** "Doctrin. N. V." T. II. p. 545. b.

†† Ibid. p. 516. b.

Let us now, independently of these striking analogies, which favour so much our attribution of this coin to our Neápolis, take into account the information which we have from SESTINI; that he procured it in Smýrna, once the depository of the marbles before us, and at all times, as I have already observed, the chief point of egress for the “*lauta supellex*” of the interior to the western world; that, moreover, the only cities of that name which could with any show of probability advance rival claims to the ascription of this coin are those of Makedonía and Karia; that the first of these might seem to be excluded by its remote and transmarine position, and the latter by the blank attached to its name in the records of archæology, unless we listen to the unsustained conjecture of the illustrator of the Hunterian cabinet: still more, that we now see the Ionian city brought tangibly before us in its alliance with Art, and so far rescued from its former obscurity: little doubt, methinks, can remain as to the alternative we should adopt in this question.

It is due, however, to the truthfulness of this essay, to admit what may appear to some to be a weak point in this evidence, which is, that I confess my inability to account for the absence of ΜΥΗΣΙΩΝ from these coins; at least, to explain it to my entire satisfaction. We see it in the epigraph of the sculpture; and it may very reasonably be asked, Why is it not present in the former, if they really belonged to the Ionian site? I found, as I have already mentioned, the Karian city Stratonikeia described in a remarkable titulus, which I copied during my tour through Lydiá,* as Ἀδριανόπολις τῶν Στρατονεικέων, and subsequently recognised it under the same appellation in two of its Imperial coins.† That the coins before us should not exhibit parallel designations, such as Νεαπολιτῶν Μυησίων, seems strange; insomuch that I feel confident that, had ECKHEL been cognizant of this variance between the coins and our epigraph, he would have used it as an unanswerable argument against SESTINI.

It may be urged, however, that the circumstances of the two cases were so different as to detract considerably from the force of such reasoning. When the Stratonikeians, actuated by a commendable sense of gratitude, adopted for their city a new and Imperial name, they would naturally feel disinclined at

* “Fascic. Inscr. Gr.” i. p. 120. n. xxxv.

† Vide Eckh. D. N. V. ii. p. 591. a. Num. Anecd. p. 210. Tab. xii. n. 15.

the same time to suppress all mention of their older and Royal one ; and therefore it is, that we find them studiously combining both in all their public monuments of a certain period. But so far as we possess the means of judging, we may presume that the Ionian Neapolitans could act on no such principle. " Neápolis," it is true, sounds very differently from " Mýes," yet, in the matter of association, not so much so as " Hadrianópolis" from " Stratoníkeia," the very designation " New City" being at once and necessarily suggestive of the Parent town, which had preceded it in the order of time. We may reasonably suppose, therefore, that they refrained from any Direct notices of their origin in their Numismatic records, reserving it for their other public monuments, such as that now before us. I say advisedly, Direct notices, for such as are of an Indirect or Suggestive kind, that is, Hints or Intimations sufficiently obvious to their compatriots of Ionía, may be presumed, on the ground of Analogy, to have existed on their coins. We may conjecture, for instance, that the notice of the Dionysiac worship, in the autonome cited above, may have been intended as a memorial of the more ancient Mýes ; and, on the same principle, we may view the type which SESTINI's coin exhibits on its reverse as representing in allegory the re-erection of the latter under happier auspices in the form of Neápolis. In other words : these effigies, interpreted as Ideographs, may possibly have served as notices of the particular cult and improved fortunes of Mýes. Truth, however, compels me to acknowledge, that the scanty materials at our disposal, consisting of a short sentence from one geographer, an equally brief and incidental notice from another, and two coins of disputed attribution, supply us with very inadequate grounds of speculation.

I proceed now to the discussions subordinated above to my fourth general head ; in the first of which I proposed to inquire, what deity our *Néa πόλις* was the likeliest to have for its Tutelary ; or, at least, what deity came powerfully recommended to Attikós as the subject of his anaglyph in her quality of Exponent of a pre-eminent Cult. An answer to either of these questions, as definite as circumstances will allow, is an essential pre-requisite to the end which I hold in view.

As to the first, it is quite clear that we possess no conclusive evidence. It is true, that one of the coins just now examined, the Autonome, presents the head of Diónysos ; but who can argue from this, that he had occupied the rank

of a Tutelary in Neápolis, or against the presumption that it may be sufficiently explained by the prevalence of the Dionysiac worship in the neighbouring cities of Ionía, Lébedos, and Téos, the communities of that region having been accustomed to reciprocate with each other their numismatic types and effigies?*

I betake myself, therefore, to the alternative of the quasi-tutelary, in the hope of dealing more satisfactorily with the question in this form, which is less embarrassing in proportion as it is less restricted. It possesses also the advantage of enabling us to repeat our use of the important notice respecting Neápolis, which has been lately cited from Strabo.† This has acquainted us with two facts: the first, which has already been made available . . . that there existed in Ionía a town of that name; another, which is now to be pressed into our service, that “this Neápolis had been formerly a dependency of Éphesos, but belonged to the Samians at present,” that is, at the time of the geographer’s inditing the clause, which was during the reign of Tiberius.

The importance of this notice to us, in the present stage of our inquiry, consists in its informing us, that Neápolis held the rank of a dependency; for let us suppose it cancelled, or, what is equivalent, that either the writer had stopped short after the words, *Εἴτα Νεάπολις*, or that, as not infrequently happens, a lacuna had replaced the notice which he has added; what should we now have had to guide us? We should have regarded Neápolis as an independent city, and had nothing to aid us in determining its Cult but the uncertain evidence of a single coin, and the vague analogies of the other Ionian states. Whereas, the contrary being now known to have been the case, and we being cognizant of the Primary cults of Éphesos and Sámos, our choice is naturally directed towards two, that is to say, of the Ártemis Polýmastos and the Héra, either Eileíthya or Nymphéútria, corresponding to the Roman “Lucina” and “Pronuba.”

Here I may observe, in order to guard against any misconception, that I am quite conscious of its by no means following as a thing of course, that the Tutelary cult of the dominant city, and of the subordinate, should prove identical; nor, as is clear from what has been said, is it at all necessary that we should suppose it in the present case. All I ask to be conceded to me is, that the chief divinity of the former, represented in such a sculpture as the present,

* See instances of this above, p. 135.

† See above, p. 146.

must always have proved acceptable in the latter, as cementing municipal alliance by a fusion thereof with religious sympathies. It now remains, therefore, that we should estimate the respective claims of the above-mentioned deities to impersonation, by pre-eminence, in a Charisterial monument erected in Neápolis, at the period when this sculpture was executed.

That the Multimammia would have occupied a secondary rank on the present occasion appears probable from the fact, that for a long period of time the connexion between Éphesos and Neápolis, as dominant and subordinate, had ceased; and that, in point of fact, she has not been chosen is evident from the absence of her personal accessory types, implied in her epithet of *πολύμαστος*. We direct, therefore, our attention to the Nymphéútria, as having the weight of certainty on her side in comparison with the Éphesian Prostátis, and of the highest probability, as regards any other. Should this be conceded, we shall find it resulting in a singular coincidence, but one at which I must arrive by pursuing the same course of implicative argument that has conducted me to my present position.

The coincidence to which I allude, expressed in general terms, is this: from the probable date of the anaglyph before us, and certain characteristics observable in it, I consider myself entitled to infer, that its immediate subject was an Augusta, who had during her lifetime been deified under the name of the very goddess whose tutelary claims we have been led to regard as paramount in the locality of Neápolis; and the final result at which I arrive is, that Attikós, in the true spirit of a Greek, had taken occasion to pay his court to his Imperial mistress, and gratify at the same time his religious predilections, by offering a Charistérion which was the exponent of the latter under the semblance of the former. The details into which I am about to enter, as confirmatory of this persuasion, will occupy the remaining heads of my argument, and close this section of my memoir.

These particular heads relate to the Age of the sculpture, the Rank of the female represented by it, and her Identification. I now propose to discuss the first of these, chiefly from evidence supplied by the epigraph, partly furnished by the anaglyph itself.

It is at all times a matter of extreme difficulty to pronounce as to the age of an inscription, during the Græco-Roman period, from the forms of its

characters, as nothing can be conceived more capricious, in certain instances, indeed, more fantastical, than the liberties which the engravers of those days allowed themselves in this department of their art. The utmost we can effect in the great majority of cases is to assign probable limits: but it happens often, unfortunately, that these limits comprise intervals of time so lengthened as to render them practically useless as chronological aids. For example: we take an inscription which contains a letter that we may deem characteristic, and to which we may be enabled to assign a limit in antecedence: we then observe its progress, and perhaps find it disappearing at a certain epoch, during which it is replaced with another form more or less similar: we then pass on, and observe, it may be, the last of these giving place, in its turn, perhaps to its immediate predecessor, and subsequently resuming its hold of the epigraphic alphabet. Here the alternations with which we have to deal are in no slight degree embarrassing; to exemplify which I descend to the particular cases of the Sigma in the epigraph of Thelymítres, and the O-méga in that of Attikós, these appearing to be, respectively, their most distinctive characters.

I have observed the former of these in tituli so early in the Imperial times as the reign of Claudius;* then, in the time of Septimius Severus, gradually rounding off its angular extremities so as to assume the shape of the Roman C,† and subsequently, in the age of Constantius the Second, between whom and Claudius there intervened a period of little less than three centuries, resuming its ascendancy in its pristine form;‡ then abdicating it permanently in the succeeding reigns. In a similar way, we meet the angular O-méga, as it appears in the epigraph of Attikós, in the age of Hadrian;§ then opening out its base angles so as to assume the cursive form with which we are so familiar, in that of Severus,|| and afterwards re-appearing in the time of the first Leo,** more than three hundred years after the first-mentioned epoch.

The only expedient which is left to the epigraphist under circumstances so embarrassing is, to summon to his aid, if possible, some concomitant letter, the dates of which may serve to counteract the fluctuations of its associate, and thus enable him in some degree to steady his chronological balance.

* Vide Fascic. III. p. 310. n. CDXIV. a.

† Ibid. p. 17. n. XLVI. c.

‡ Fascic. II. p. 248. n. CCXLIII.

† Fascic. II. p. 248. n. CCXLIII.

§ Vide Böckh. C. I. T. I. p. 473. n. 490.

** Fascic. I. p. 45. n. VIII.

To apply this to the case immediately before us, I select the *Sigma*. As I have mentioned, all forms of this letter began gradually to disappear from *tituli* in the time of Severus, with the exception of one, namely, the semi-circular type, with which, however, the present character maintained a struggle for ascendancy. The testimony, therefore, which it affords coincides with that of the *O-méga* in defining this reign as the later limit of the epigraph, as at no future period have I observed them to be contemporaneous. Indeed, subsequently to this period, I have seldom or never observed the *Sigma* in its re-entrant form. Accordingly, I circumscribe the age of this epigraph within the limits defined by the reigns of Hadrian and Septimius Severus.

Ere I pass from this subject, it may be proper that I should advert to another ground of conjecture as to the age of a Græco-Roman *titulus*, which may occasionally be found useful, particularly in classifications according to the order of time. This supposes, however, that it exhibits a Roman designation, comprising, at least, a *Nomen* referrible to some one of the *Augusti*. By this we are directed, "*primâ facie*," to the time of that particular Emperor; but in reality, the only safe use we can make of it is, to rest in that period as a Limit, of which alone it is the exponent. For example: we may reasonably presume that the sculpture of *Thelymitres* had not been executed prior to the age of Tiberius; but any opinion more precise it is impossible to pronounce, for the obvious reason, that the Roman name of *Lysimâche* may have descended to her from an ancestor, but in what degree removed we are wholly ignorant. This will be better understood by our citing a Greek-Roman name of higher mark, such as that of the Orator *Heródes*. Had we been destitute of all notice respecting him, with the exception of what is implied in his Roman designation, *Tiberius Claudius*, how grave an error should we commit by assigning him, on the ground thereof, to the time of the Successor of Augustus! We know, however, that it had descended to him, and may with reason conclude that it first came into his family from some official connexion with the Emperor Tiberius.

To return to the epigraph of *Attikós*: as no Roman name appears in this in its present condition, and reasons have been alleged for concluding that none had existed previously to its defacement, we are destitute of any aid from that source. Let us try, however, whether we cannot compensate this defi-

ency by some remarkable characteristic in the anaglyph itself. This conducts us to the third ground of argument on which I rely as preliminary to its identification.

The mode in which the Hair has been arranged constitutes, if I mistake not, the characteristic to which I allude. It is well known to all who are conversant with the numismatic records of the Augustæ, or who have had opportunities of studying the ascertained sculptures of them which are extant, that these monuments present, in all cases, evidences of most elaborate coiffure. Indeed, the amount of labour bestowed on most of the Imperial female heads appears to have been such as to render hopeless all rivalry on the part of the coiffeurs of modern times. All their dexterity of manipulation it casts wholly into the shade. This, even as a general characteristic, every one must observe: but when a Type was to be carried out, or an emblematical accessory to be represented, as was sometimes the case when they had to deal with heads, the fair owners of which had anticipated their posthumous apotheóseis . . . then it was that their superiority became most transcendent.

Let none present imagine for a moment, that I am now wilfully transgressing the bounds of sober sense, or forgetting the gravity which becomes the archæologist, while descanting on this part of my subject. Still, should I have erred, I hope for pardon of my error, were it but in consideration of this memorial of classic art which has enshrined such features in a casket so elaborately wrought. This accessory alone stamps it with a value of which little conception has been hitherto formed, to aid which the following notices may perhaps be of use.

I have already expressed my belief that the Archetype of this head-dress, as well as of that denominated "the Faustina," was the Greek "*Kórymbos*,"* which consisted, in its simpler form, in such a treatment of the hair-weft as gave it a spiral form, and then carried it up to the crown, where it was confined by a bodkin or hair-pin.† It seems, however, to have been susceptible of numberless

* Supr. p. 112.

† Vid. Passow, 1. p. 1329. b. in *Κόρυμβος*: "wie *κρωβύλος*, ein geflochtner Haarbüschel oder Haarzopf, der spiralförmig aufgewickelt, und auf der Scheitel mit einer Haarnadel befestigt ward, vorzugsweis eine Haartracht der Jungfrauen, da der ähnliche Haarbausch bey den Jünglingen *Κρωβύλος* hiess:" citing at the same time Winckelm. "Gesch. d. Kunst." 5. 1. 14. and "Tratt. prelim." 4. 66.

Hesýchios defines it, *εἶδος τῆς ἐμπλοκῆς ἥ ἐστὶν ἀνηνεγμένη ἀπὸ μέσου τοῦ μετώπου ἐπὶ τὴν*

varieties, all more or less superadding to the ancient model. Thus the coiffure of Galeria Faustina, the most graceful, perhaps of its kind carried out the antique type by a separation of the entire weft into weftlets or distinct tresses, each of which, when braided into the spiral form, was brought in its order to the back of the head, and then drawn up to the crown, the whole being apparently kept together by a band winding round it from the base of the head to the vertex. The concluding process appears to have been the braiding the ends of the weftlets into separate plaits, so as to form a single, sometimes a double rosette, and then confining each to its place, as was done with the upper tuft of the *Kórymbos*.

The disposition of the weftlets in our anaglyph seems to have been still more elaborate. The process appears to have been as follows: the whole weft was first drawn in distinct bands to the rear of the head, and then separated into divisions, of which one was employed in forming a rosette behind, whilst the remainder was drawn from thence in double braids to a central point in the forehead, so as to cover the space which had been left exposed by the former operation, and then folded up. This process being effected for both sides of the head, resulted in those symmetrical involutions observable in front, which resemble so much a certain well-known fossil type as to suggest the idea that, on this particular occasion, an esoteric meaning was intended to be conveyed. All here present are conversant with the subject of this allusion; the symbol

κορυφήν: and with reference to this type, Herakleides of Póntos is introduced by Athénaios (xii. p. 512. c.) thus expressing himself concerning the older Athenians: *κορύμβους δ' ἀναδούμενοι τῶν τριχῶν χρυσοῦς τέττιγας περὶ τὸ μέτωπον καὶ τὰς κόμας ἐφόρουσαν*. These *τέττιγες* were adopted as symbolical of their vaunted title of *αὐτόχθονες*, and are mentioned by Thukydides in a passage where he defines the corresponding *κρωβύλος* of the males, i. 6. *χρυσῶν τεττίγων ἐν ἔρσει κρωβύλον ἀναδοσμένοι τῶν ἐν κεφαλῇ τριχῶν*. These words the Scholiast (Thukyd. Bipont. T. v. p. 308.) explains thus: *ἐν ἔρσει, ἢ ἐν εἰσέρσει, ἢ ἐν πλοκῇ. κρωβύλος δὲ ἐστὶν εἶδος πλέγματος τῶν τριχῶν ἀπὸ ἑκατέρων εἰς ὅξυν ἀπολήγον. ἑκαλείτο δὲ τῶν μὲν ἀνδρῶν, κρωβύλος· τῶν δὲ γυναικῶν, κόρυμβος· τῶν δὲ παιδίων, σκορπίος*. It is evident that Virgil had this mode of coiffure present to his thought when so briefly describing the head-dress of his Sidonian princess, *Æneid*. iv. 138. "Crines nodantur in aurum:" and equally so that the "Tutulus" of Varro (*De L. L.* vi. T. i. p. 90. Bipont.), specimens of which, more or less ornate, appear in the coiffures of the Augustæ, had its origin in the Korymboid type. His words are: "Id Tutulus appellatur ab eo, quod matres familias crines convolutos ad verticem capitis . . . dicunt Tutulos." See Wasse's note on the foregoing passage of Thukydides, Ed. Bipont. T. i. p. 298.

of the Ἀμμὺν κερὰς of the Greeks, that is, the Amûn-Neph* of their Egyptian masters in mythological lore. Whether the former were correct in identifying Amûn with their Zeûs, the consort-brother of Héra, is at present a question of little moment.†

There appear, therefore, to be certain characteristics in which these head-dresses agree, and others in which they differ. They agree in the general Korymboid type, and the general mode of carrying it out: but in the order in which the bands of hair are disposed, so as to reach the summit of the head, as also in their disposition when confined there, they differ. These, however, are merely matters of detail, whilst their essential sameness is so manifest, that I hesitate not to assign to this sculpture, even on the ground of the coiffure which it represents, a date in contiguity to that of the Antonini, Pius and Marcus Aurelius. That it does not actually belong to their period I am convinced; firstly, from my inability to trace in it the slightest resemblance to features so familiar to me as are those of the Augustæ of the Antoninian family; secondly, and chiefly, because we possess no evidence whatsoever of the deification during life of either Galeria, or Annia,‡ Faustina, or of the consorts of Commodus and Aurelius Verus. Both these reasons, however, concur in directing our attention to Fulvia Plautilla, the junior Augusta of the Septimian family, as answering in the completest manner all the exigencies of our problem. The proof of this, which will conduct us at once to the final

* Basmur. Δεον-Ηίξι, figures of whom I found sculptured in the temple at Tchone-myris in the Óasis "El Khardjeh." Hence the Greek Ἀμυνήβις in an inscription of that place: Fascic. III. p. 362. n. CDXXI. a.

† Vide Wilkinson, ubi supr. vol. iv. p. 268.

‡ Vide Böckh, C. I. I. p. 45. b., and p. 458. on n. 435. 6., where he observes, "In Triopio Herodis Attici Ceres nova fuit Faustina ut videtur minor." This attribution must, however, be received with some caution, as recent investigations have led me to conclude, not only that Regilla had deceased in the lifetime of the junior Faustina, but also, that her claim to the impersonation of Deó (Ceres) in the Inscr. Triop. II. vv. 6. 48. cannot be sustained by collateral evidence. The reader will, therefore, correct the statement respecting Annia Faustina in p. 114. supr., as to her deification during life, under the designations νεωτέρα θεός in Böckh's Eleusinian inscription, and Δηὸ νέη in the Triopeian; and is referred to the commentary of FRANZ on v. 6. of the latter, in Corp. Inscr. T. III. pp. 921-3.

The determination of this question, however, either the one way or the other, in no wise affects my argument on the present occasion.

restoration of the epigraph, forms my last head of discussion, and will conclude the present section.

The tributes of honour which were accorded by the Hellenic states to the members of the Imperial family, of which Septimius Severus was the head, were the results, perhaps, in part of the wise policy acted upon by them after the series of auspicious events which marked the outset of their career. Towards the Greek name, in particular, they seem to have adopted one of conciliation, which must have been the more grateful in proportion as it was unexpected, the East having declared in favour of Pescennius Niger, and the sanguinary battles, which terminated his rivalry with his life, having been fought on the fields of Kyzikos, Nikaia, and Issós. These successes of Severus were followed in due course by the prosperous issue of his contest with Albinus, and his Parthian victories, which resulted in the establishment of his rule; yet we read of no severities practised against the Greek cities, with the single exception of Byzantium. This forbearance doubtless arose from prudential motives on the part of Severus, when he advanced on his memorable expedition against the Parthians, and was unwilling to leave disaffection in his rear. We possess, indeed, evidence of his anxiety to provide against such feelings in a fragment of an Ephesian inscription,* which singularly confirms the account given by Spartianus† of the unrelenting cruelty with which, even during the acmé of his contest with the Parthians, he pursued the remnant of the Pescennian party, who appear to be styled therein *Παῖδες τῶν ἀνοσίων*.

The Greeks, therefore, with these vindictive proceedings before their eyes, were terrified, perhaps, rather than allured into their manifestations of regard towards the Augustus and the members of his family. The result, however, was the same, for they were lavished with no sparing hand. I have observed them in all quarters of Asiatic Greece, the region with which we are now concerned, and certain of them bearing unequivocal testimony to the policy of conciliation which had been adopted. Galatia, Bithynia, Mysia, Lydia, Karia, Phrygia, Pisidia, contribute each its quota, a full share falling to the lot of the Augusta Julia Domna. In one of Lámpsakos, for example, she has a statue

* Vide Böckh. T. II. p. 608. n. 2971.

† Viz. "Inter hæc Pescennianas reliquias, Plautiano auctore, persequabatur, ita ut nonnullos etiam ex amicis suis, quasi vitæ suæ insidiatores, appeteret." In Severo, c. xv.

decreed to her, represented as invested with the twofold attributes of goddessship, under the names of Hestía and Deméter. The titulus, to which I have already referred,* proceeds thus: **ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝ . ΣΕΒΑΣΤΗΝ . ΕΣΤΙΑΝ . ΝΕΑΝ . ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑ . Η . ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑ**, and the cost of the honour is stated to have been borne by a certain Dionýsios, **ΥΠΕΡ . ΤΗΣ . ΕΙΣ . ΤΟΥΣ . ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΥΣ . ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑΣ**, that is, “in consideration of the Piety which is due from him to the Crowns,” the Insignia that he wore as “Stephanephóros of the universal Augustan family.” In another titulus, one of Nikomédeia,† a votive altar is dedicated to her; and a third, of Laodíkeia,‡ records an offering of the same class.

Caracalla also has been allotted his due proportion of honours; sometimes, as in the case of Domna, in conjunction with Severus; at other times, and in coins, with Geta, but chiefly alone. Thus, in a titulus of Euméneia,§ he has a statue decreed to him by the Senate and People, under the appellations, **ΤΟΝ . ΙΔΙΟΝ . ΘΕΟΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΗΝ**. In a similar spirit, either of grateful sentiment or conciliation, the Ephesians style him and his brother, in one of their Neocorate coins,|| **ΝΕΟΙ . ΗΛΙΟΙ**, “orientia sidera;” a constellation which, doubtless, they made the object of especial worship: and in another, exhibiting the effigy of Caracalla, the following type appears on the Reverse; four temples, respectively, of Severus, Julia Domna, Caracalla, and Geta, explained by the accompanying epigraph, **ΔΟΓΜΑΤΙ . ΚΥΝΚΛΗΤΟΥ . ΟΥΤΟΙ . ΝΑΟΙ**, a type and legend germane, in a special sense, to their vaunted prerogative of a fourfold Neocorate.**

It were a useless expenditure of time, nor indeed is it necessary to my purpose, to submit all the proofs which I have collected of the deference††

* Supra, p. 114. † Böckh, C. I. II. p. 967. n. 3771. ‡ Ibid. (Franz.) III. p. 41. n. 3940.

§ Ibid. p. 19. n. 3884.

|| Eckhel, T. II. p. 520. a.

** That is, if we receive KHELL's solution of the Temples (see Eckhel, II. p. 517. b.) grounded on Tacit. Annal. III. 61. viz. that they represented those dedicated to Ártemis, Diónysos, Heraklês, and Apóllon. But it appears to me that even this can be reconciled to VAILLANT's interpretation of the type, by supposing that these deities were severally represented by Domna, Severus, Caracalla, and Geta. We have seen Livia Drusilla styled “Ártemis” in an Ephesian coin, cited above, p. 113., and it is certain that Caracalla was figured under the person of Heraklês. See note (††), p. 114.

†† A stronger term might be used in reference to the tituli which recorded the adoption of Severus into the Antoninian family. Böckh has published one of Miletos (C. I. II. p. 561. n. 2878.), in which he is styled Son of Marcus Aurelius, Grandson of Pius, Great Grandson of Hadrian, etc., to which

accorded to the members of this family, both singly and conjointly, by the Greek states. My end is sufficiently attained by merely stating as a fact, that scarcely a city of any note in the whole compass of the Western Asia is without its memorials of a forward zeal in their cause. Statues were decreed, divine honours paid, temples erected, and games instituted, in commemoration either of the substantial benefits or the considerate forbearance, which the Hellenic provinces experienced, as a return for their ill-advised partizanship, during his season of trial and embarrassment, from Septimius Severus.*

I return to the Augusta, with whom I am more immediately concerned, whose semblance I have been led to attribute to the anaglyph before us. She also had her share in those ascriptions of honour, but her name does not appear so frequently as those of her Imperial relatives in extant monuments. We have seen her, as well as Domna, invested, even during her brief and inauspicious career as Augusta, with the insignia of deification; and the records which I have cited were, doubtless, accompanied with many such memorials as I consider the present one to be; but the exceeding rarity of their occurrence now is sufficiently explained by the mournful events which so suddenly terminated her prosperity. The sole records of the honour which more immediately concerns us at present, her impersonation of the Samian tutelary, that have as yet come under my observation, are a Phrygian inscription and a Karian coin. I have already ad-

a titulus cited by ECKHEL from GRUTER, in his *Doctr. N.V.* vii. p. 173. b. adds the title *DIUI. COMMODI. FRATER*. But an inscription copied by CHANDLER from a pedestal of a statue of Commodus, on the site of the Phokian Ámbryssos, casts these, and such like, into the shade, it representing Severus as "the Brother of Commodus" during the lifetime of the latter. This was effected, as there is every reason to infer from the appearance of the marble, by erasing the original epigraph, and replacing it with another more in conformity with the pretensions of the reigning emperor. See Böckh, vol. i. p. 852. n. 1736.

* The following tituli demonstrative of this appear in the part of Böckh's work which relates to Asiatic Greece:—Ánkyra supplies one in honour of Caracalla, vol. iii. (Franz) p. 93. n. 4046. Nikomédeia, one in that of Julia Domna, ii. p. 967. n. 3771. Lámpsakos, another, cited above in p. 114. Éphesos, one in that of Caracalla, Bö. ii. p. 609. n. 2973.; in that of Severus and Domna, one, n. 2972. Smýrna contributes one to Severus, ii. p. 727. n. 3177.; another to Caracalla, p. 727. n. 3179. Sárdeis, one to Severus, ii. p. 813. n. 3458. Thyáteira, one to Caracalla, ii. p. 825. n. 3484. Eumén-eia, another to the same, iii. p. 19. n. 3884. Sebasté, a third, iii. p. 17. n. 3871. Afun Qárah Hissár, one to Severus, iii. p. 18. n. 3788. Sagalassós, one to Severus and Caracalla, iii. p. 186. n. 4371. The titulus of Azanoí, iii. p. 10. n. 3837., probably originated from Severus himself.

verted (with a citation of the epigraph of the latter) to these in a former part of this section.*

I now address myself, according to my promise, more particularly to the Inscription, which I consider myself as having been the first to publish in a correct form. It proceeded from a Greek of eminent station, and commemorated an important bequest to his fellow-citizens. The part thereof most interesting to us at present is the Preamble, consisting of a precatory formule on behalf "of the Universal House of the Augusti, the Sacred Senate, and the People of the Romans:" **ΑΓΑΘΗ . ΤΥΧΗ . ΥΠΕΡ . ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΝΕΙΚΗΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΙΩΝΙΟΥ . ΔΙΑΜΟΝΗΣ . ΤΩΝ . ΔΕΣΠΟΤΩΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΝΕΙΚΗΤΩΝ . ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΩΝ . ΛΟΥΚΙΟΥ . ΣΕΠΤΙΜΙΟΥ . ΣΕΟΥΗΡΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΜΑΡΚΟΥ . ΑΥΡΗΛΙΟΥ . ΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΠΟΠΛΙΟΥ . ΣΕΠΤΙΜΙΟΥ . ΓΕΤΑΣ . ΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΝΕΑΣ . ΗΡΑΣ . ΡΩΜΑΙΑΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΣΥΝΠΑΝΤΟΣ . ΟΙΚΟΥ . ΤΩΝ . ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΝ . κ . τ . λ .** I here direct attention more particularly to the manner in which the Consort of Caracalla has been designated: not by her family name, which has been wholly suppressed, but by that under which she had been deified as, by eminence, "the New Héra." It might appear that in this attribution there was something remarkable . . . something more special and emphatic than ordinary . . . intended to be conveyed; and the more so, as this merging both **ΠΛΑΥΤΙΑΔΑ** and **ΣΕΒΑΣΤΗ** in her goddess-title stands in marked contrast to the complete enumerations which go before.

The inference which results from these premises seems to be inevitable. Let us now, for the sake of clearness, take a review of them . . . the several gradations by which we have advanced to our present position.

We have found, in the first place, by examining the Tutelary hypothesis on its own merits, that this anaglyph represented either a Prostátis, or a deity equivalent to such, in the Myesian city. Our second step was, to identify her, on grounds equally probable, with the goddess Héra, by proving that this city was none other than the Ionian Neápolis, and thus establishing its territorial connexion with Sámos. Our third was, to show from certain distinctive elementary forms in the epigraph, that the age of the sculpture was, in all probability, that of Septimius Severus. Our fourth was, to produce additional confirmation of the correctness of this date, from the coiffure delineated

* Vide *supr.* pp. 114. s.

in the anaglyph; as also to deduce the further inference, that its immediate subject had been an Augusta. I now, in the fifth place, draw my conclusion that, by reason of her investiture with the Heræan attributes, which at once placed her in the Tutelary rank that I had shown before to be pre-eminently entitled to consideration in this argument, the only Augusta whom we can regard as satisfying the conditions of our problem is the daughter-in-law of Septimius Severus.

Such has been the course of my argument, in the prosecution of which I have shut out all appeal to lineamental evidence, or that which might have resulted from a comparison of the anaglyph with numismatic effigies. I may state here my reasons for this exclusion. Experience has taught me, in the first place, how very deceptive such comparisons are, as well as the inferences to which, but too frequently, they conduct; how much their availableness depends on the skill of the artist, on his fidelity, as also on the opportunities which he possessed of acquainting himself with authentic resemblances. These, it is clear, most materially affect the truth of any identifications, more especially in cases where the only standard to which we can resort is the evidence of coins or medals: for it is at all times very difficult to pronounce as to the subjects of such anaglyphs as the present from numismatic forms, which are always expressed in Katagraph, or, as we term it, Profile. In proportion, therefore, to this difficulty would be the chances of error in placing this sculpture in the rank of a true Eikón on the basis of any such comparison.

I would not, however, be understood as wholly rejecting it, but as desirous of working out my conclusion, in the first instance, solely by a mental process, and until I had arrived at that, of postponing the mechanical; for so I may term an identification which eye-sight alone effects. No sooner, therefore, had I accomplished the former of these, and exhausted at every step the evidences at my disposal, than I ventured the dangerous experiment of applying the test of numismatic proof; and here again I beg to acknowledge the prompt and zealous co-operation which I have experienced from my immediate predecessor in this inquiry. In consequence of my cabinet not numbering amongst its Imperial coins any memorial of Plautilla, I requested that Gentleman to supply the deficiency from that of the University, and this, accordingly, he did with all the scrupulous exactness which every one who hears me will have anticipated.

The letter which he addressed to me in answer to my application, contained accurate iconographs of four coins of Plautilla,* two of which were evidently contemporaneous with our anaglyph, and alone possess any value as suitable standards of comparison on the present occasion. The others were minted at a later period: but no two aspects can be conceived more different than Plautilla's when she entered the family of Severus, and Plautilla's, when horror-stricken at the murder of her sire, and deposed from the station which she had so dearly purchased.

The general contour of the features in the earlier coins resembles that in our anaglyph quite as closely as could reasonably be expected, when it is considered, that the former had issued from the Imperial mint, whilst the latter was elaborated in the studio of a provincial artist. The Coiffure has evidently been modelled after the same general type which is discernible in the "Faus-tina," and that of our sculpture. The whole hair-weft has been separated into distinct bands or weftlets, as in these; then each is made to assume a spiral form, and brought in its order to the back of the head, where it is folded up in regular succession, the result being a single rosette. The adoption of the two-fold involution represented in the anaglyph, which, as I have remarked,† was perhaps intended to carry out a symbolical type with exclusive reference to the Heræan impersonation, has caused the difference between the two head-dresses, that represented in the coin, and that of the sculpture.

I have now little more to add, excepting a few words on the mutilation of the epigraph, which my individual experience may possibly render of some weight in the general argument, or which may at least prove interesting. It is my fixed opinion, that the primary mischief done to this marble . . . that, I mean, which was observable ere it left Smýrna . . . was of ancient, not modern, date, and the result of design, not of accident, carelessness, or the natural progress of decay. I do not, however, as some might be disposed to do, attribute it to the Christians of its original locality, or regard it as the expression of their enmity to the Septimian family, but to Caracalla's deeply-rooted aversion to his consort and her father Plautianus, which led, in a brief period after her nup-

* These coins are numbered 879. 880. 881. 882. in the Catalogue which has been published by the Rev. John A. Malet, F. T. C. D., p. 69.

† Vide *supr.* pp. 156. s.

tials, to the ruin of both. In less than a year after that event, the latter was, by command of his son-in-law, in the presence, and with the acquiescence of Severus, assassinated in the palace; and this was speedily followed by the erasure of his name from all the public monuments into which it had been introduced.* Plautilla's sentence was perpetual banishment from Rome, and consequent deposition from her Imperial rank; for no coins bearing her name and effigy were struck after this period; and finally, her exile and her life were terminated together by order of the inhuman Caracalla, yet reeking from his murder, under the most revolting circumstances, of his brother Geta.

Now, as an epigraphist, and possessing a certain amount of experience . . . the result of travel and study . . . in this department of classical archæology, I may presume to say, that I could have conducted the preceding argument with a saving to myself of much troublesome detail in the following manner. We see this epigraph defaced, not on the side which contains notices of the donor and the site wherein it had been erected, but on that which gave the history of the offering, that is, the Original whom it represented, and the Motive by which the individual who offered it was actuated. A person versed in such inquiries would not be slow of asking the question, How is this? There must have existed some cause, less vague than mere accident, for a determination so remarkable of the destroying force. He would then betake himself to an in-

* A remarkable instance of this is afforded by an inscription which has been published by GRUTER, p. XLVI. 9. It proceeds thus: HERCVLI . INVICTO . ET . DIBVS . OMNIBVS . DEABVSQ . SACRVM . PRO . SALVTEM . IMP . L . SEVERI . ET . M . AVRELIO . ANTONINO . CAESARI . AVG . NN . ET . ||||| . ||||| . ||||| . ||||| . ||||| . C . V . PR . PR . that is, *Herculi invicto et dibus omnibus deabusque sacrum, propter salutem Imperatoris Lucii Severi et Marco Aurelio Antonino Cesari, Augustis nostris, et (Lucio Fulvio Plautiano) clarissimo viro, Præfecto Prætorio; etc.* The date of this inscription must have intervened between the years U. C. 951., when Caracalla was declared "Augustus," and 956., which witnessed the downfall of Plautianus. Indeed, as Geta has not been mentioned, it seems likely that it was inscribed in the former of these years, antecedently to Geta's nomination as "Cæsar."

The space after the last ET became a blank immediately after the palace-scene, of which Dión and Herodianós, especially the latter, have left us such startling narratives. See D. LXXXVI. 4. H. III. 12.

This is by no means a solitary instance, as FONTANINI has proved: ECKHEL, "Doctr. etc." VII. p. 225. a.; and the weight which is thereby imparted to our argument is clear; as we may be certain that Caracalla, who treated the remains and the memory of the father with such indignity, was not more indulgent to the feelings of the daughter. Vide p. 165. note (*).

vestigation of the probable date, and this he could only prosecute in the manner already detailed, and with a similar result, namely, that it ranged between the periods of Hadrian and Septimius Severus. His next step would be, to seek amongst the Augustæ of that interval (for to such the type of the coiffure would at once limit the observer of whom I speak) for some individual, one whom circumstances had rendered so obnoxious as to expose her to the contumely of having her name and titles erased from a public monument; and, as we have seen, it would not be long ere he made his selection. It would naturally devolve upon the Consort of Caracalla, a memorial of whom we may be certain that the vindictive temper of her husband would not have suffered, so far as he could prevent it, to remain.* The identification of the anaglyph having been thus established, its Charisterial nature would follow as a legitimate consequence, leading to the restoration of the second line of its epigraph; and the Heræan impersonation, so peculiarly appropriate to the locality, a Samian town, would complete the first.

My reason for preferring to this the course of argument which I have adopted in the memoir is, that I could indulge no reasonable hope of so fully impressing my audience with my own conviction that this epigraph had been intentionally mutilated, as to make it the basis of my identification of the sculpture: for thus, the very groundwork of my reasoning would, in the eyes of most, have partaken of the weakness of an hypothesis.

I conclude this section with my final restoration of the epigraph, which I effect by substituting for the word **Αγαλμα*, in the first of my previous forms,†

* The following may, perhaps, be regarded as a striking example of this. It is well known that sculptured memorials of Plautilla are exceedingly rare, which proportionately enhances the value of those that remain to us. One has been preserved in the Royal Collection of the Glyptothek in Munich, numbered 212., which the learned compiler of the descriptive catalogue of its treasures, Professor LUDWIG SCHORN, has noticed, under the heading "Femme Romaine," in the following terms: "On a donné à ce buste d'un travail non achevé et très endommagé le nom de Faustine cadette; cependant on aurait plus de raison pour le croire le buste de Plautille, épouse de Caracalla. Vid. Mongez, *Icon. Rom.* 49." This ascription fully explains the appearances here noted: the artist had not time to finish his task ere Plautilla's career terminated, and then his "Idol" was consigned "to the moles and the bats."

† Vide *supra*, p. 133.

the goddess-name by which I have demonstrated that Plautilla was known amongst the Hellenic states : this gives us the following :

ΤΗΝΝΕΑΝΗΡΑΝΕΙΣΤΗΝΝΕΑΝΜΥΗΣΙΩΝΠΟΛΙΝ
ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΗΣΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑΣ < ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ

Τὴν Νέαν Ἥραν, εἰς τὴν Νέαν Μυησίων Πόλιν,
᾿Υπόμνημα τῆς εὐχαριστίας ᾿Αττικός.

Attikós hath presented this bust of the New Héra, a memorial
Of gratitude, to be erected in Neápolis of the Myesians.

SECTION III.

I proceed now to the division of my general subject, which I have termed the Archæological, as referring to the ancient artistic type, or, as we denominate it, fashion, in accordance wherewith these sculptures have been elaborated. With this end in view, I shall venture to extend my remarks beyond the bounds which alone might, at first sight, appear to be necessary; but for this I am quite certain that I shall have my claim to indulgence recognised by the auditory I address, aware, as it must be, of the close relationship which subsists between the zographic and glyptic modes of delineating external forms. Colour and its shades effect in one what Relief accomplishes in the other, but necessarily limited by its own inherent simplicity to a particular category of results; a truth of which the ancients appear to have been quite conscious, when they resorted, as in certain cases we have ocular evidence and the testimony of their writers to prove that they did, to the combination of colours with the pure lineaments of sculpture, to effect by this mean a fusion of the ideal and the actual; an approximation of the former to the familiar objects of sense, or in other words, of every-day life. Such meretricious adjuncts, by summoning which to its aid the glyptic art impairs its proper and essential dignity, the modern schools have, with excellent taste, discarded, judging aright that Relief, considered as the exponent of anatomical and geometrical proportions, is quite adequate in the hands of the accomplished artist to effect its own purposes.

The Greeks had several terms to express pictorial and sculptural results : * *Ἀγαλμα*, and its diminutive, * *Ἀγαλμάτιον*, * *Ἀνδριάς*, *Εἰκών*, * *Ξόανον*, *Πίναξ*, *Τύπος*. To all these Appellatives were frequently subjoined, in order to the designating the nature of the material which was employed, or the class of art to which the work belonged. Thus we meet with * *Ἀγαλμα μαρμάρινον*, or *λίθινον* ; *Εἰκὼν μαρμαρίνη*, or *λαϊνέη* ; *γραπτή*, or *γραπτὴ ἔνσπλος*, or *γραπτὴ ἐν ὀπλοῖς ἐπιχρύσοις*, or lastly, *γραπτὴ τελεία*, which we find sometimes expressed, *πίναξ τέλειος*.

In order to the correct appreciation of these terms, I beg to offer a few remarks, commencing with the first, * *Ἀγαλμα*. The primitive import of this has been stated by Hesýchios, *Πᾶν ἐφ' ᾧ τις ἀγάλλεται*, and so also the author of the Etymologicum Magnum, *καλλώπισμα*, following Homer in a well-known passage ;* and Heródotos,† writing of the Issedones ; *Τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ψιλώσαντες καὶ ἐκκαθήραντες καταχρυσοῦσι· καὶ ἔπειτα ἅτε ἀγάλματι χρέωνται*, that is, “as an ornament in which they pride themselves.” But much the most frequent sense of *ἄγαλμα* in this author is *ξόανον*, which was applied distinctively to express “a statue of a god :” in accordance with which we read, *Τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Διὸς*,‡ and *τοῦ Πανός* :§ * *Ἀγαλμα Ἀπόλλωνος κεχρυσωμένον* : || ‘ *Ἐν δὲ τῷ περιβλημένῳ τόπῳ νηὸς τε ἔνι καὶ ἄγαλμα ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνέστηκε Περσέος*,** namely, of a demigod. The Attic writers, however, apply it by no means exclusively to the designating statues of the objects of their worship, but, as Heródotos†† in certain cases shares this, its peculiar meaning, with * *Ἀνδριάς*, so the former very frequently express by it sculptured Human forms. This latitude of signification occurs very often in Tituli, including another extension of it on the authority of Pausanías, namely, to anaglyptic sculpture.

* *Ἀνδριάς*, in its proper import, means a statue of a human form ; but is sometimes, as has been already remarked, used to express one of a deity, only, however, as delineated under the semblance of that form. This, its primary and most general import, that is, a representation of the human form, led to a farther expansion of its meaning, as appears from a passage in Plato’s “ Republic :” ‡‡ * *Ὡς περ οὖν ἂν εἰ ἡμᾶς ἀνδριάντας γράφοντας προσελθὼν ἂν τις εἴψεγε*,

* Iliad, δ. 144.

† Vide iv. 26.

‡ II. 42.

§ II. 46.

|| VI. 118.

** II. 91.

†† VI. 118. fin. Perhaps also, I. 183. p. m.

‡‡ De Republ. iv. p. 420. c.

λέγων ὅτι οὐ τοῖς καλλίστοις τοῦ ζώου τὰ κάλλιστα φάρμακα προστίθεμεν. Here ἀνδριάντας γράφοντας unquestionably should not be rendered "painting statues," which was only an occasional resource of the sculptor, but "painting pictures of the human form," in the perfect delineation of which Colours are always requisite.

The next term to which I shall address myself is *Εἰκών*, which offers a very wide field for illustration. Agreeably to its Etymon, it signifies Representation, Resemblance, Image, and consequently embraces both Painting and Sculpture in their largest acceptations, whether in whole or half-length, in the perfect statue or statuette, the bust or the herma, of whatever material, including also Anaglyphs in every gradation of relief. It was usual, however, to define these several references of the term by qualifying appellatives, as we have already intimated, and shall demonstrate more fully in the course of these observations. One remark may be made, in passing: that the conception of similitude inherent in *εἰκών* originated the adverbial use of its fourth case, corresponding to the Latin "Instar," an instance of which we meet in the verse of a Memnonian titulus* commencing, ΒΑCΙΛΕΩC . ΕΩΟΥ . ΕΙΚΟΝΑ, that is, κατ' εἰκόνα, "after the similitude."

That *Εἰκών*, by itself, was used to express pictorial representation is evident from a passage in Lucian,† wherein it is determined to this meaning, apart from any other: Τοιαύτη σοι καὶ αὐτῇ, Λυκίνε, ἀνακείσθω ἡ εἰκών. Thus also, in a titulus of the Karian Aphrodisiás, which I have published in my second volume of Inscriptions,‡ we read: ΑΝΑΤΕΘΗΝΑΙ . ΔΕ . ΑΥΤΟΥ . ΕΙΚΟΝΑΣ, namely, "portraits," a sense evidently fixed by the corresponding passages in the two inscriptions which follow, wherein epithets are added determinative of the sense. To these we shall shortly have occasion to refer.

Again, that *Εἰκών*, taken singly, may signify a statue is evident from its application by Heródotos when speaking of the Egyptian priests: § Ἀρχιερεὺς γὰρ ἕκαστος αὐτόθι ἵσταται ἐπὶ τῆς ἑωυτοῦ ζόης εἰκόνα ἑωυτοῦ· and still more expressly in the following: || Τὴν μάλιστα στέρξας τῶν γυναικῶν Δαρεῖος, εἰκὼ χρυσέην σφυρήλατον ἐποίησατο, that is, "a statue of malleated gold." So also De-

* Fascic. III. p. 266. n. CCCLXXXIV. 4., to the illustrations in my note on which add the following from Herodian. I. 9. v. fin. καὶ νομίσματα ἐκόμισαν ἐκτετυπωμένα τὴν ἐκείνου εἰκόνα.

† Vide "Imagines," xviii.

§ Vide n. 143.

‡ Fascic. II. p. 25. n. LII. 9.

|| VII. 69. fin.

mosthénes :* *Στάσαι δὲ καὶ εἰκόνας τρεῖς ἐνδεκαπήχεις ἐν τῷ Βοσπορίῳ, στεφανούμενον τὸν δᾶμον τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑπὸ τῷ δάμῳ τῶν Βυζαντίων καὶ Περυνθίων.* Lucian may also be cited in confirmation of this :† *Εἰλατίωνι τὰν εἰκόνα ὁ Δᾶμος εὖ ὀρχησαμένην τὰν μάχαν.*

Lastly, that *Εἰκών*, similarly placed, may signify a resemblance expressed in Relief, is apparent from the use made of it by three of the Evangelists in their passages respecting the incident of the tribute-money.‡ The Imperial effigy, it is true, is in these denominated *εἰκών*, precisely as we apply the term to the anaglyph of Thelymítres, without reference in either case to the process of elaboration, but simply to the result, namely, a likeness. Otherwise we should imagine some such adjuncts to it as *ἐνκεχαραγμένη* in the first, and *ἀνάγλυπτος* in the second of these instances.

This leads me to exemplify the use of *Εἰκών* accompanied by certain determinative epithets, some of which I have already enumerated. We meet, in the first place, *Εἰκὼν γραπτὴ*, or, as it is sometimes expressed, *ἐν γραφαῖς*. This signifies a Portrait. Thus Herodianós, in a passage relative to Caracalla : § *ἔσθ' ὅπου δὲ καὶ χλεύης εἶδομεν ἀξίας εἰκόνας ἐν γραφαῖς κ. τ. λ.*; and Heródotos, in a clause cited in the preceding section : || *Εἰκόνα ἐωυτοῦ γραφῇ εἰκασμένην*, sc. *ἀνέθηκε*. Again; in the Didymeian titulus which Böckh** has published from WALPOLE, we read : **ΚΑΙ. ΕΤΕΙΜΗΣΑΝ. ΕΙΚΟΝΙ. ΓΡΑΠΤΗΙ. ΕΠΙΧΡΥΣΩΙ.** The first of these epithets defines the Class of art, the second, the Style; that is, it was a likeness of Ithyklês, the individual to whom the honour had been accorded, painted on a gold-ground, and most probably, because most usually, on a board of circular or oval form, the Greek term for which was *Ὀπλον*, corresponding to the Roman "Clupeum." There can be no manner of doubt respecting the truth of this interpretation, when epigraphs are considered in which more than one of the terms of art previously enumerated are used; for

* *Orat. de Corona*, p. 256. 11. *Comp. Leptin.* p. 478. 4. † *Lysias*, Fr. LXVIII. *Aristotél, Rhetoric.* II. 28.

‡ *Vide Saltat.* XIV.

§ *Vide S. Matth.* XXII. 20. et cetera. Lucian has the following passage in his "Pseudómantis," XCVIII. : *Γραφαί τε ἐπὶ τούτῳ, καὶ εἰκόνες, καὶ ξόανα, τὰ μὲν ἐκ χαλκοῦ, τὰ δὲ ἐξ ἀργύρου εἰκασμένα.* The class of these *εἰκόνες* is more fully explained in c. LVIII. by the words *νόμισμα καινὸν ἐγκεχαραγμένον.*

§ *H. R.* IV. 8.

|| *Supra*, p. 116.

** *C. I. II.* p. 561. n. 2879. 8.

then we become possessed of a clue to guide us to the meaning of each, in consequence of one standing in either absolute or implied antithesis to another. I have, therefore, regarded it as wholly unnecessary to enter into a detailed notice of the arguments by which the truth, in the various aspects of this question, has been elicited,* as a connected view of the authorities to which I now proceed to appeal will be amply sufficient to establish it on satisfactory grounds.

Such authorities are the following. I have published three Tituli copied at Aphrodisiás,† in which posthumous honours were decreed by the municipal authorities of that city to each of three youths, the sons of a certain Kallías, of whom he had been successively bereaved. These honours were, *Εἰκόνες γραπταὶ ἐν ὀπλοῖς ἐπιχρύσοις*, *Ἀγάλματα*, and *Ἀνδριάντες*. Precisely the same with these are the tributes of respect mentioned in another titulus from the same site, as having been rendered to the memory of a certain Mýon by his surviving parent, with the sole exception of the limiting appellation *γραφτῶν* being left out; the part of the epigraph with which we are concerned proceeding thus:‡ **ΕΙΚΟΝΩΝ . ΤΕ . ΕΝ . ΟΠΛΟΙΣ . ΕΠΙΧΡΥΣΟΙΣ . ΑΝΑΘΕΣΕΣΙΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΓΑΛΜΑΤΩΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΝΔΡΙΑΝΤΩΝ**. This, however, was an omission of no moment, as the introduction of the words *ἐν ὀπλοῖς ἐπιχρύσοις* sufficiently indicates both the Department and the Style of these *εἰκόνες*; that they were pictorial resemblances, and executed on a gold-ground.

It may fairly be assumed in all these cases, that the terms of art which are employed cannot, with any reason, be esteemed synonymous; in other words, we must regard the *εἰκόνες γραπταί* as quite distinct in meaning from the *ἀγάλματα*, and both these from the *ἀνδριάντες*. Now, it will hardly be contended that the last of these expressed any products of art but Statues, in accordance with the almost universal acceptance of the term. The direct consequence of this is, that *ἀγάλματα*, as never applied to Pictorial art, must have meant *Anaglyphs*; and this, moreover, is a sense which, as I have stated before, Pausanías sanctions.§ We have thus the two classes of the department of Sculpture re-

* Vide Böckh's, in his C. I. II. pp. 662. ss. on n. 3068. B. I. 27.

† Vide Fascic. II. pp. 25. ss. nn. LII. LIII. LIV.

‡ Böckh, II. p. 513. n. 2771. Col. I. II. 10. ss.

§ Supra, p. 167. Comp. Siebelis. Præfat. ad Pausan. T. I. p. xlii.

presented in these tituli by expressions appropriate to each; whence it follows, by just inference, that the *εἰκόνες γραπταί* must have been the representatives of that of Painting; and this is, moreover, conformable to the constantly occurring designation thereof, by *γραφή*, as well as of the artist by *γραφεὺς*. In illustration of this I may cite a clause from the description given by Pausanias of the throne of the Olympian Zeus: * *Ὁ δὲ Θρόνος ποικίλος μὲν χρυσῷ καὶ λίθοις, ποικίλος δὲ καὶ ἐβένῳ καὶ ἐλέφαντι· ἔστι καὶ ζῶα τε ἐπ' αὐτοῦ γραφῇ μεμιμημένα, καὶ ἀγάλματα ἐστὶν εἰργασμένα.* The meaning of *Ζῶα* here is, "living forms," whether of gods, men, or animals, with pictorial representations of which the Throne was decorated; and *Ἀγάλματα* has been interpreted as corresponding to the Roman "Sigilla," that is, Statuettes, such as those which are enumerated farther on.† I see no reason, however, to prevent our supposing that *εἰργασμένα* may here signify *ἀνάγλυπτα*, and that the artistic results denominated *ἀγάλματα εἰργασμένα* may have corresponded to our "Medallions."

Additional evidence of this being the correct meaning of *Εἰκὼν γραπτή* is supplied by the important Teian inscription respecting the ephebach Aischrion which Böckh has published, amongst others, from the Sherard Papers in the British Museum; wherein we have a rather full enumeration of these terms of art, accompanied in each case with an explanatory concrete. It proceeds thus:‡ *ΟΙ . ΕΦΗΒΟΙ . ΚΑΙ . ΟΙ . ΝΕΟΙ . ΚΑΙ . ΟΙ . ΜΕΤΕΧΟΝΤΕΣ . ΤΟΥ . ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΟΥ . ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝΑ . ΜΕΛΕΑΓΡΟΥ . ΕΦΗΒΑΡΧΗΣΑΝΤΑ . ΚΑΛΩΣ . ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩ . ΧΡΥΣΩ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΙΚΟΝΙ . ΓΡΑΠΤΗ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΙΚΟΝΙ . ΓΡΑΠΤΗ . ΤΕΛΕΙΑ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΙΚΟΝΙ . ΧΑΛΚΗ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΓΑΛΜΑΤΙ . ΜΑΡΜΑΡΙΝΩ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΙΚΟΝΙ . ΧΡΥΣΗ.* Here we perceive a sixfold honour accorded to the Chief of the youths, with the last five particulars of which we are at present concerned. These I translate in their order: "a half-length portrait, a full-length portrait, a bust in bronze, a marble bust in anaglyph, a bust in gold;" to prove which, I proceed on the assumption, that the artistic terms in this enumeration are severally distinct, that is, the *Εἰκὼν γραπτή* from the *Εἰκὼν γραπτή τελεία*: these again from the *Εἰκόνες χαλκή* and *χρυσή*, and the *Ἀγαλμα μαρμαρίνον* from all. The learned epigraphist above mentioned has, it is true, decided that the last of these signifies "a marble statue;"§ but

* Vide v. 11. 2.

† Comp. Böckh, II. p. 663. b.

‡ C. I. II. p. 673. n. 3085.

§ Id. pp. 663. a. Böckh's argument is, that it would be unworthy of a municipal body to offer

this can only be a matter of opinion, inasmuch as we have already seen that Anaglyphs are often styled Ἀγάλματα; and what there is, in consequence, to prevent our supposing that this class of high art had its representative in the foregoing detail, that accordingly, Ἀγάλμα μαρμάρινον may have been a Bust in relief, of a style of execution similar to that of the University sculptures, it is difficult to conceive. The Εἰκόνες mentioned in the third and fifth places may have been Statues in their respective metals, or Protomai, as I have chosen to understand the passage, or Hermai, all these being consistent with the general meaning of Εἰκών. Unless, therefore, we exclude the pictorial department from being represented on this occasion, which seems scarcely reasonable, we have no alternative but to regard its right as respected in the presence of the Εἰκόνες γραπταί: the first of these signifying "a half-length portrait," painted, doubtless, in the customary style on an oval or circular shield with a gold-ground (ἐν ὀπλῳ ἐπιχρύσῳ), and the second, the τελεία, expressing one of "a full-length."

That I am correct in this position, namely, that the addition of τελεία converts the Εἰκὼν γραπτὴ into "a full-length," will hardly be questioned in the presence of the following passage from Herodianós.* His words are, when writing of Elagabalus on a certain occasion: Εἰκόνα μεγίστην γράψας παντὸς ἑαυτοῦ οἴος προΐων τε καὶ ἱερουργῶν ἐφαίνετο, that is, "a Portrait of amplest dimensions, of his whole person." What more intelligible exégesis we could have of Εἰκὼν γραπτὴ τελεία, as well as of its synonym, Πίναξ τέλειος,† than is afforded by this passage of the historian, I find it difficult to imagine. The same holds good in the instance of another remarkable Teïan inscription,‡ wherein certain honours are mentioned as having been decreed by a certain College (τὸ Κοινὸν τῶν συναγωνιστῶν) to a distinguished Benefactor named Kráton, one of which was, **ΑΝΑΘΕΙΝΑΙ . ΔΕ . ΑΥΤΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΙΚΟΝΑ . ΕΝ . ΤΩΙ . ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΩΙ .**

a mere anaglyph: to which I reply, hardly more so than to accept one from an individual to be set up in a conspicuous position in the city subjected to its control, as was unquestionably the case with the sculpture of Attikós. Supr. pp. 115. s. 131. ss.

* H. R. v. 5. m.

† See the passage in the "Life of Lykûrgos," by the Pseudo-Plutarch, cited by Böckh in C. I. II. p. 664. a.

‡ C. I. II. p. 661. n. 3068. B. l. 27.

ΓΡΑΠΤΗΝ . ΤΕΛΕΙΑΝ. This we must also conclude to have been a Portrait of life-size, and to be susceptible of the same illustration, otherwise the addition of *τελείαν*, as of *τελεία* in the former instance, would have been absolutely nugatory.

Some may urge, it is true, against the applicability of the clause in *Herodianós* as a basis of illustration, the apparent emphasis of *μεγίστην*, which might seem to imply that the "whole length" he mentions had been one of supernatural dimensions: in other words, that the Portrait of the Augustus expressed the Ideal so familiar to the Egyptians, who were accustomed to symbolize the indomitable energy and prowess of their victorious rulers through the medium of painting or sculptures far exceeding the life-size. I submit, however, that this supposition is scarcely reconcileable with the concluding words, *οἷος προΐών*, etc.: "Such as he was wonted to appear when coming forth to offer sacrifice." Nothing superior to the life-size seems fairly to be deducible from *μεγίστην*, when taken in connexion with these expressions, which serve to explain *παντός ἑαυτοῦ*, just as the latter, in its turn, is exegetical of *μεγίστην*.

My auditory will have remarked, that these *Εἰκόνες* are sometimes termed briefly *ἔνοπλοι*, at other times *γραπταὶ ἐν ὅπλοις*, but generally, more at length, *γραπταὶ ἐν ὅπλοις ἐπιχρύσοις*. With respect to these designations I may premise, for the sake of clearness, and as introductory to my farther observations, that I conceive them to be allied to each other as Genus and Species. The first I regard as comprehending under its more general form of expression both Painting and Sculpture; the last two as restricted to Painting alone by the concrete *γραπταί*. I esteem it the more necessary to state this, as the whole three have been treated by no mean authority, but in my opinion somewhat precipitately, as strictly synonymous; an assumption which would effectually exclude the anaglyphs before us from being ranked, as I conceive they have a full right to be, under the generic title of *εἰκόνες ἔνοπλοι*, and as such entitled to be considered as representatives of an Archaic style of art.

I now proceed to explain the import, and trace the history, of these *ὅπλα*, from the earliest notices of them which we possess: secondly, I shall submit my reasons for extending the designation, *εἰκόνες ἔνοπλοι*, so as to comprehend the department of sculpture: thirdly, I propose to connect them with, by showing that they were the precursors of, the Medallion style: lastly, I shall

state my reasons for considering such anaglyphs as those before us to be true exponents of the primitive type of art. Should I blend with these topics such illustrative references to the kindred department as may occasionally suggest themselves, it will be solely in pursuance of the method with which I commenced; one resulting from the extreme difficulty of disuniting considerations of the "Glyptá" and the "Graptá" in any discussions of this nature.

The descriptive concrete ἔνσπλος, that is, ἐν ὄπλῳ, signifies "in a shield," the word having been borrowed from military phraseology, in which ὄπλον was a general term including every article of warlike equipment, and its plural ὄπλα expressed defensive armour in particular, namely, the Cuirass or the Shield. I now speak with reference to the use made of these terms by Heródotos,* himself an Asiatic Greek: but we shall find the singular also employed in tituli to express the derivative artistic meaning with which we are now more immediately concerned.

In the case of Portraits, the material employed in preparing these Shields appears to have been wood, always, as I conceive, overlaid with gold; and hence the epithet ἐπίχρυσος in the more complete designation. On this ground the artist laid his colours, and traced his resemblances. A memorial of this kind was, as we have seen, essentially honorary: decreed by governing bodies, or communities, as testimonies of the esteem in which citizens of eminence were held; and sometimes suspended from the walls of public edifices, such as Temples, Gymnásia, Basilikaí, or the like, so as to be viewed at all times; sometimes deposited in apartments, called from them ὀπλοθήκαι, the "Armaria" of the Romans, whence they were drawn out and exhibited on occasions of solemnity.†

These ὄπλα were known to the people last mentioned under the corresponding appellations "Clypei," or, "Clupea;" whence the forms painted, or expressed in relief upon them, were termed "clypeatæ imagines;" a designation which seems to have been nothing else but a literal version of εἰκόνας ἔνσπλοι. I have here used the words "expressed in relief" with reference to these Clupea, and proleptically; with what intent, and how authorized, I now proceed to explain.

We find their origin in Roman times traced by Plinius as far back as the

* Vide iv. 23. fin. ix. 63. fin. Comp. Schweigh. Lexic. H. T. ii. p. 152. b.

† Böckh, I. p. 172. n. 125. 6.

age of Appius Claudius, the founder of the illustrious "Gens Claudia." He expresses himself thus :* "Suorum clypeos in sacro vel publico privatim dicare primus instituit, ut reperio, Appius Claudius, qui consul cum Servilio fuit anno urbis CCLIX. Posuit enim in Bellonæ æde majores suos ; placuitque in excelso spectari et titulos honorum legi." That the "imagines," or semblances on these "clypei," were expressed in Relief, might be inferred from the account which he continues to give of them in the next section, as well as from the étymon that he assigns to the term itself: for he attributes the next dedication of "clypei" to Marcus Æmilius, in the year of the City DCLXXI, and then adds: "Id quoque Martio exemplo: scutis enim, qualibus apud Trojam pugnatum, continebantur imagines; unde et nomen habuere clypeorum." This passage can convey no other meaning but the following: that the "scutum" which presented an "Imago" on its surface was termed, for that reason, a "clypeus," that is, it was known by a designation which, from its étymon, would have been absurd, had not the "Imago" been an Anaglyph. "But," some one may say, "this étymon may have only existed in our author's fancy; I pause, therefore, ere I admit a conclusion which pre-supposes its truth." To this I reply, that, supposing even "Clypeus" not to be formed from γλυπτός, the comparison of the shields dedicated by Æmilius with those which had been used during the Ilian war, is amply sufficient to place them beyond the limits of the Graptá, with a recollection present to our minds so vivid as that of the shield of Achilleús.

So far, therefore, as we have proceeded, we have found reason to class the Roman "imagines clypeatæ," or "in clypeis," under the head of Reliefs. In later ages we find them principally ranked under Portraiture, and briefly designated "clypei;" or, if expressed in sculpture, carried out in the Medallion style. The former, however, strictly corresponding to the εἰκόνας γραπταί of the Greeks, gradually usurped the position of supremacy, as presenting in most cases a more attainable result. For example; Macrobius† mentions one, a half-length portrait of Quintus Cicero; not, it is true, in an artistic spirit, but for the sake of

* Vide xxxv. 3. 1.

† Saturnal. II. 3. "Nec Q. Ciceroni fratri circa similem mordacitatem pepercit: nam cum in ea provincia, quam ille rexerat, vidisset clypeatam imaginem ejus, ingentibus lineamentis usque ad pectus ex more pictam, (erat autem Quintus ipse staturæ parvæ,) ait, 'Frater meus dimidiis major est quam totus.'"

recording a witticism of his illustrious relative, the Orator, at his expense. Trebellius,* also mentions a "clypeus aureus" in honour of the Emperor Claudius, and Suetonius† speaks of a similar mark of distinction conferred upon Caligula. A fourth instance may be cited from Capitolinus,‡ who informs us, that to the honours which were rendered to the memory of Hadrian, his adopted son and successor added the dedication of "a most magnificent shield."

These examples relate to such "clypei" as were termed by the Greeks *εἰκόνες γραπταὶ ἐν ὄπλοις ἐπιχρύσοις*. We learn, however, from a characteristic anecdote concerning the well-known Pontius Pilatus, which Philon has recorded, that there existed "clypei" to which the first part of this designation was inappropriate. He writes, that this governor, wishing on a certain occasion to gratify his hatred of the Jewish nation, under the pretence of doing honour to his master, caused shields overlaid with gold to be dedicated with all the customary solemnities within the precincts of Herodes' palace: but deeming it expedient to qualify the insult, lest he should shock overmuch the religious principles of the Jews, he left out the Imperial effigy, contenting himself with introducing merely words explanatory of the purport of the offering, and his own name as the dedicator.§

To return: it may, perhaps, be reasonably concluded from the account which has been given of the "imagines clypeatæ," a designation in such evident proximity to the Greek *εἰκόνες ἔνοπλοι*, that the latter also included sculptural as well as pictorial resemblances. I am aware, that in drawing this inference, I am at issue with the learned Böckh, who would limit the Greek expression to its designation of Portraits, regarding it as merely an abridged

* In Claudio, iii. "Illi clypeus aureus, vel ut grammatici loquuntur, clupeum aureum, senatus totius judicio in Romana curia collocatum est; ut etiam nunc videtur expressa thorace vultus ejus imago."

† In Caligula, xvi. sub f. "Quas ob res inter reliquos honores decretus est ei clypeus aureus, quem quotannis certo die collegia sacerdotum in Capitolium ferrent, Senatu prosequente, etc."

‡ In Pio, v. "Clypeum Hadriano magnificentissimum posuit, et sacerdotes instituit."

§ Phil. Jud. Ed. Mangey, vol. ii. p. 591. a. Οὗτος (scil. Πιλάτος) οὐκ ἐπὶ τιμῇ Τιβερίου μάλλον, ἢ ἕνεκα τοῦ λυπῆσαι τὸ πλῆθος, ἀνατίθεισιν ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἱερόπολιν (sc. Hierosolyma, τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν in S. Matth. xxvii. 53.) Ἡρώδου βασιλείῳ ἐπιχρύσουσιν ἀσπίδας, μήτε μορφὴν ἐχούσας, μήτε ἄλλο τὶ τῶν ἀπηγορευμένων, ἔξω τινὸς ἐπιγραφῆς ἀναγκαίας, ἢ δύο ταῦτα ἐμήνυσ, τὸν τε ἀναθέντα, καὶ ὑπὲρ οὗ ἡ ἀνάθεσις.

form for *εἰκόνες γραπταὶ ἐν ὀπλοῖς ἐπιχρύσοις*.^{*} It may, however, be asked: if we thus set bounds to the Greek technic, why not also to the Roman, unless we choose to grant a richer nomenclature to the people who received than to that which conferred the gift of art? The answer is clear: because we should have to surmount the express testimony of Plinius, whose "clypeated images" embrace both departments of art. But exclusively of this; as we have seen that the designation *εἰκόνες* is so general as to include all types of the Glyptic as well as of the Graptic art, why not enlarge correspondently the domain of the *ἔνοπλοι*, so as to comprise not merely the *εἰκόνες γραπταί*, but also those which we may term *γλυπταί*, *ἀνάγλυπτοι*, or *ἐξεργασμένοι*? The truth is, that in consequence of the vagueness of the Greek technology in the department of sculpture . . . one, however, more apparent than real,[†] as we shall shortly see . . . a large amount of gratuitous assertion has characterized the language of archaeologists in dealing with its artistic terms.

A clause from one of the inscriptions of Kyme, which Böckh himself has cited,[‡] may serve to exemplify this: **ΟΝΤΕΘΗΝ** (*ἀνατεθῆναι*) . **ΔΕ . ΑΥΤΩ . ΚΑΙ . ΕΙΚΟΝΑΣ . ΓΡΑΠΤΑΝ . ΤΕ . ΕΝ . ΟΠΛΩ . ΕΝΧΡΥΣΩ . ΚΑΙ . ΧΑΛΚΙΑΝ . ΚΑΤΤΑ . ΑΥΤΑ (*ὡσαύτως*) . **ΔΕ . ΚΑΙ . ΜΑΡΜΑΡΙΑΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΧΡΥΣΙΑΝ . ΕΝ . ΤΩ . ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΩ**. We perceive here the *εἰκὼν γράπτα* distinguished from the *χαλκία*, *μαρμαρία*, and *χρυσία*; the former as a portrait, from the latter, as either statues or busts (*προτομαί*), and, if these, executed either in their complete proportions or in anaglyph. Böckh has espoused, in opposition to Völkel, the first of these alternatives, but we may ask, on what grounds that we can at all deem certain? *Εἰκὼν* may signify, as has been shown, a Resemblance in Relief; why then withhold that legitimate acceptance here, or object to our even supposing that all the three were, like the Portrait, *ἔνοπλοι*? For aught we know,**

^{*} Vide Böckh, C. I. II. p. 126. n. 2059. 40., and the note in p. 128. a.

[†] The Greeks appear to have been sufficiently precise when the occasion demanded it. Thus, in a Rheneian epitaph (Böckh, II. p. 248. n. 2321.), a stèle presenting an anaglyph precisely similar to those referred to towards the close of this Section, pp. 183. s., is styled *γλυπτή*. The epigraph underneath, it is true, is in metre: but we may be certain, that the epithet would not have been added, had it been contrary to propriety to have used it.

[‡] Vide C. I. II. p. 664. b. The whole inscription has been given in p. 849.

or any archæologist can satisfactorily prove, the *εἰκὼν μαρμαρία* may have been of the precise type of art which appears before us in the University sculptures; just as we have conjectured of the *ἄγαλμα μαρμαρίνον* in a Teïan inscription cited above,* and of the *ἀγάλματα* which are mentioned in those of Aphrodisiás.†

One thing is, however, abundantly clear, whatever may be thought of these conjectures, which is, that the "clypeated images" had a position within the domain of sculpture as well as of painting. Had it been usual with the Greek artists to attach, in all cases, specific designations in the instance of the former, as it was in that of the latter; to term, for example, a work of art such as those before us, *εἰκὼν γλυπτὴ ἔνοπλος*, or, *ἄγαλμα ἔνοπλον*, in the same way that a half-length in Painting was distinguished as *εἰκὼν γραπτὴ ἔνοπλος*, or, *ἐν ὄπλῳ ἐπιχρύσῳ*, more correctness at the present day would have been the result, and a considerable amount of controversy saved. This, however, we cannot suppose that the authors of the several epigraphs esteemed in any wise necessary, as, without doubt, the notices which they did introduce were amply sufficient for their purposes, the terms of art being more critically understood with the works of art present to serve as their illustrations. There may be some weight also in the following observations: that as Sculpture, or the processes allied thereto, were in all probability the primitive modes employed of expressing forms, no qualifying adjunct would, in its case, be considered necessary; whereas Painting would require such, being in its first stages the exception, and not the rule.

I conclude this Head with repeating, that I attach much importance to the denominations which I have cited above from Suetonius, Plinius, Macrobius, and others, as aids towards our forming just conceptions in this matter. We have "Clypei" or "Clupea," "Imagines in Clypeis," and "Imagines Clypeatæ," corresponding respectively to *ὄπλα*, *εἰκόνες ἐν ὄπλοις*, and *εἰκόνες ἔνοπλοι*. The first of those, "Clypei," was merely an abbreviated form for the last two, which I have not observed paralleled by a corresponding use of *ὄπλα*, excepting as forming a part of the compound *ὀπλοθήκη*, which means "a repository of the shields," that is, of the Portraits painted on such. The case is different with

* Supr. p. 171.

† Supr. p. 170.

respect to the second and third denominations, as illustrating the last of which I may cite an Olbian titulus that Böckh has edited in his second volume;* a decree in favour of an individual named Theoklês, one of the clauses of which appears as follows: **ΑΝΑΤΕΘΗΝΑΙ . ΑΥΤΟΥ . ΕΙΚΟΝΑ . ΕΝΟΠΛΟΝ . ΔΗΜΟΣΙΑ . ΕΝ . ΤΩ . ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΩ**. Here the learned epigraphist lays it down as certain, that the correct version of *εἰκόνα ἑνοπλον* is "tabulam pictam," notwithstanding the absence of the almost invariable concrete *γραφτήν*. This may be true; yet it appears a somewhat arbitrary assumption, with the above-cited passage of Plinius† before us, in which the co-ordinate expression "Imagines in scutis" most unquestionably relates to the glyptic art. Would it not be preferable, instead of imposing dicta, to avail ourselves of an authority ready to our hands, and interpret *εἰκόνα ἑνοπλον*, "imaginem in scuto;" in modern language, "a medallion anaglyph"? That our authority is Roman creates no manner of difficulty when it is considered that Plinius treats of a department in the arts which his countrymen of Rome cultivated only at second-hand, as indeed every other type of high art: for it must not be forgotten, that the Greeks redressed the balance which indicated their political inferiority by their unapproachable eminence in all pursuits which confer his essential dignity on man; that,

"Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes
Intulit agresti Latio."‡

I am now conducted to the third head of this inquiry, namely, the true origin of those beautiful forms of which decorative architecture has so profusely availed itself: I speak of the embossed effigies on circular or oval areas with which all are acquainted; and not of these alone, but also of coins and medals, the obverses of which exhibit Heads or Protomai. I esteem it as certain, at least in the highest degree probable, that the precursors of these in the order of artistic sequence were the very *εἰκόνες ἑνοπλοὶ*, or "imagines clypeatæ" of which we have just been treating; and therefore it is, that I have retained the designation "Large Medallion Busts," from the heading prefixed by Dr. Todd to his Notices respecting the University sculptures in the Proceedings

* Supr. p. 177. note (*)

† Supr. p. 175.

‡ Horat. Epist. l. 1. 156. s.

of the Academy. We are, however, to guard against the oversight of receiving this Title as with absolute correctness designative of the class of sculpture to which they belong. Existing, as this type did, from the era of nascent art, when no numismatist can suppose that Medals were thought of, much less Medallions, it is evidently, in an archæological sense, correct that it should replace, as a denomination, one which strictly is expressive of a class of its descendants. Medallion is, as all know, the Italian "Medaglione," the French "Médailion:" therefore, to use the term without due caution, as characterizing the anaglyphs before us, might contribute to the inversion of a genealogy in the arts. This caution consists in our understanding it as applied, without reference to the order of time, in a purely descriptive sense; as an artistic term which every one comprehends, and free from the pedantry which would unquestionably attach itself to the more correct nomenclature of Macrobius, or the Greek tituli.

This observation acquires additional force by considering that, in all probability, the "clypeated images," like the present anaglyphs, presented full fronts. I believe this to have been the succession in art; firstly, to represent the lineaments in full; then, in profile, or side-face. A remarkable passage of Plato goes far in establishing this, namely, the progress of the glyptic art from the direct front of the εἰκὼν ἑνοπλος to the side-face of the Medals or Medallions. He writes thus: * Φόβος οὖν ἔνεστιν, ἐὰν μὴ κόσμιοι ὦμεν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς, ὅπως μὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ διασχισθησόμεθα, καὶ περιῖμεν ἔχοντες, ὥσπερ οἱ ἐν ταῖς στήλαις, καταγραφὴν ἐκτετυπωμένοι, διαπεπρισμένοι κατὰ τὰς ῥίνας γεγονότες, ὥσπερ λίσπαι. The penalty of which the speaker is here so apprehensive, and which he foreshadows by so intelligible a comparison, seems very evidently to mark the art-sequence to which I have adverted.

If now we comprehend under the term στήλαι, which the Philosopher has used to express the Tablets on which his Profiles (κατάγραπτα) were sculptured, tablets of every form which it was customary to employ, we come at once to the class of "clypeated reliefs." These do not lose their essential character by a diminution of their size, or a change of the material in which they are elaborated. They may be in Gold, Silver, or Bronze, and may vary from any con-

* Sympos. p. 193. a.

ceivable dimensions to the minutest, yet assert their claim to the title of works in clypeated relief (ἔνσπλα) just as fairly as those before us; a claim, however, which I cannot but hold to be of comparatively recent date, were it for no other reason than the improved artistic skill which was requisite to the proper artistic delineation of the Katagraph.

I am now conducted to my fourth head, which will terminate my remarks on these interesting sculptures: but before I proceed to this, and thus close my memoir, I pause for a moment to revert to the Εἰκόνας γραπταὶ ἔνσπλοι, and examine how it has fared with them in the progress of high art.

The perishable nature of the materials employed in works of this kind has denied them the same longevity which has fallen to the lot of their kindred, the "Glyptá;" yet we still have a glimpse of them in their descendants, and those a numerous train: for to what other originals is it possible to assign the rounded areas and gold-grounds which characterized so long the Byzantine school of art? From the Capital of the Eastern Empire they travelled westwards; and how long they retained possession of the field ere the age of amelioration arrived is clearly proved by the still extant specimens of mediæval art which we possess, and the more elaborate productions of the German schools from the fourteenth to the fifteenth century. Whether the employment of this ornature amongst ourselves, either in the frames of our pictures, or along their inner margins, or in those elliptical bands which I have sometimes observed in glazings of a date not very remote from present times, argues a compromise between traditionary predilections and an improved taste, I submit to more competent judges to decide: but of this I am certain, that the tenacity with which I have remarked the humble Greek artist still clinging to the use of the board and the barbaric gilding of his progenitors, has more than once recalled me, in the birth-soil of our European art, to the Εἰκόνας γραπταὶ ἐν ὀπλοῖς ἐπιχρύσοις of the ancient Temples and Basilikaί.

To return from this short digression. I conceive that at this stage of our inquiry a very few words will be sufficient to prove the closeness of the bond which unites the University Sculptures to those clypeated reliefs of which I have submitted the history. My auditory will please to observe that, in order to form a correct judgment, we are to lose sight altogether, in an archæological sense, of the rectangular stéle which incloses in each case the proper stéle of

the anaglyph. There are, in effect, two stélai in both these monuments; the Primary, or Proper, being that from which the busts immediately protrude; the Secondary, or Subordinate, that which extends beyond the former, and subserved to purposes merely mechanical. Of this, in forming our conclusion as to the Type, or Fashion, of art, we are to take no account whatsoever, its purpose having solely been to attach the anaglyph to the wall in a permanent position, as also to provide space for the introduction of a sufficient epigraph, comprising at least the following notices: the Original whom the sculpture was intended to represent; the Motive which actuated the donor; his Name, and the Position for which it was destined. All this, it is manifest, could not have been effected within the boundary of the inner area unless by violating laws which no sculptor could disregard.

Other advantages were, moreover, secured by the artist resorting to this precaution; to appreciate which it is proper that we should bear in mind the difference between the destinations of such monuments as those before us, and the *εἰκόνας γραπταί*, as already explained. The latter were, in the great majority of cases, deposited in Hoplothêkai, from which they were drawn out solely on extraordinary occasions, and then suspended from walls in places of public resort (*ἐν ἱεροῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τόποις**): the *γλυπταί*, on the contrary, were destined to a permanent position in such places, and required accordingly the addition of some mean of support; such also as might contribute to the due effect of each, by obviating all chances of its coming into juxtaposition with discordant surfaces, or of any distortion resulting from a careless determination of their levels.

Such being the relations of these Stélai, it only remains that I should direct the attention of my audience, in each anaglyph, to the innermost one, the area of which has been defined by a circular boundary, as that alone which characterises it as a Type of art.† It requires but ocular evidence to prove to us that it corresponds, as nearly as was permitted by the conditions which the sculptor had to satisfy, to the descriptions which have descended to us of the Clypeates of remote antiquity. Had it not been the intention of the artist to have worked after such a model, nothing could have been easier than to have dispensed altogether with these boundary-lines; or to have selected a sufficient

* Vide Fascic. II. n. LII. 9.

† Vide supra, p. 169. 175. ss.

space in the upper section of his square stéle of an oblong form, wherein groups appropriate to his subject might have been disposed, and then have thrown up his partition lines in such styles, plain or ornate, as might appear most in unison with them. A multitude of such types are now present to my mind, which have passed under my review in different Glyptothékai, that of Athens more particularly; to none of which, however, has he directed his attention. He has selected an Archetype, one of the simplest and most chaste which antiquity presented, and of that Archetype the least complicated form; single Protomai, unaccompanied in either case by accessories derived from actual life, or mythological emblems. Yet the sculpture of Thelymitres afforded him an excellent opportunity of following a totally distinct and very usual artistic model. That it was a posthumous honour, and erected *μνήμης χάριν* by one whom the epigraph testifies to have stood towards the deceased Lysimáche in a close and dear relation, I have elsewhere expressed my conviction. The very style of the inscription induces this belief, and yet more, the aspect of the still youthful countenance in which indisposition so evidently lingers, and the outer garment (*χλαρίς*) drawn closely round the person, as though to protect it even from the atmosphere of Ionía. Now, such monumental sculptures were generally executed in accordance with an uniform type, namely, the representation of the valedictory scene before death; and why this was abandoned on the present occasion appears to be best explained by our supposing that the ancient type was regarded as giving more prominence to the features of the beloved object, as well as better adapted to recall to the remembrance of survivors some incident before her decease. It certainly admitted of a change in the customary form of the epigraph so as to adapt it to the intention of Thelymitres: for had the sculpture carried out the more generally received idea, we should have seen it accompanied by some such formule as the following: ΚΑΛΥΔΙΑ . ΛΥΣΙΜΑΧΗ . ΓΥΝΗ . (τοῦ δεινός) . ΧΡΗΕΤΗ . (or ΦΙΛΑΝΔΡΕ) . ΧΑΙΡΕ.

A very striking example of this style of monument occurs in an elaborately executed relief which came under my observation whilst sojourning near Smýrna. The anaglyph extended along the upper section of the stéle, and comprised figures of the deceased, in a sitting posture, and of the immediate members of her family. grouped before her in the attitude of taking their last farewell. The principal figure, most probably her husband, is the spokesman

on the solemn occasion, and with his right hand locked in hers, is supposed to have gone through the mournful ceremony in the words of the epigraph inscribed underneath: **ΓΩΛΛΑ. ΤΕΤΤΗΙΑ. ΓΥΝΗ. ΔΕΚΕΡΔΩΝΟΣ. ΧΡΗΣΤΗ. ΧΑΙΡΕ.** This has been published in my first volume of Inscriptions,* and another, precisely corresponding to it, which I copied at Philadelphia.† For other examples I may refer more particularly to the very ample collection of the monumental tituli of Smýrna, which the learned Böckh has published in his second volume.

I now view these sculptures conjointly, and with the evidence before us of the identity of the Models after which they have been executed, the identity also of their Styles of elaboration, as well as of the modes in which their explanatory epigraphs have been disposed, I arrive at the conclusion that they were contemporary works of art, and not only this, but that they issued from the studio of the same artist. That their age was the same may be reasonably inferred from evidence which their inscriptions themselves supply; for the very same argument which directs us to the era of Severus for the age of the sculpture of Attikós points also to the same in the case of that of Thelymítres. The only element in which they differ is the Sigma, this being rectangular in the one, and of the common re-entrant form in the other; but that these were contemporary in the time of Severus is most certain, as then more especially it was that the transition from the angular to the circular form of that character took place which terminated finally in the establishment of the latter. This criterion, therefore, adds its weight to the former; but we can advance no farther in the instance of the sculpture of Thelymítres, as its epigraph contains no allusion to guide us beyond the mere Proper names, and these afford us no manner of aid, as, exclusively of the present, no Ionian epigraph hitherto published supplies any information respecting either. This research, however, has not been without its use, inasmuch as it adds strength, by enabling us to argue “a remotione partium,” to our former presumption, that this anaglyph, as well as that of Attikós, had originally belonged to the Ionian Neápolis.

Such are the views to which I have been conducted by the fullest consideration in my power to devote to this most interesting investigation. I now,

* Fascic. I. p. 109. n. xxix. d.

† Ibid. p. 39. n. vii. d.

therefore, conclude; but not without a word of apology to Gentlemen who may, perhaps, form part of my auditory, the representatives in our Society of a high and ennobling art, if I have rashly intruded into technical details of which they alone can be competent judges. Errors, however, or oversights in such, by no means affect the soundness of the Principle which, on mature thought and a certain amount of experience as an observer, I have adopted. In this persuasion, I submit these anaglyphs to the consideration of Archæologists in general, but in an especial sense to that of their learned Trustees, as works of high art, and types of its excellency in an age which preluded its abasement; as comprising notices of peculiar antiquarian interest, and one of them, of historical and geographical; finally, as presenting us with artistic models which hold a middle place between the perished memorials of a remote antiquity and the exquisite medallion forms which a more recent antiquity has bequeathed us. As such, I recommend them to the notice which is eminently their due, in the hope that, at no distant period, I shall behold them restored in some sort to their pristine state, or occupying at least the position to which they are entitled as mementos of Ionian art.*

* I cannot take my leave of the highly interesting discussions which form the subject of the preceding sections without apprizing my reader that SMITH and the editors of Gudius have not been the only scholars who have paid attention to the epigraphs of the University sculptures. I have very lately, and not until these sheets were prepared for press, discovered them amongst the Smyrnæan tituli of the learned Böckh, whose pages I had been turning over for an entirely different purpose. I cannot but acknowledge that the discovery occasioned me a certain degree of surprise, as Neápolis finds no place in his Recensus of the Ionian sites; not even in the fourth Section of his Lydian inscriptions, which he has devoted to "Smyrna cum Hyrcanis, Magnesia ad Sipylum, Phocæa."

Our epigraphs will be found in the "Corpus Inscriptionum," Tom. II. p. 778. n. 3346., with the following Lêmma prefixed: "Smyrnæ in domo Zachariæ Græci duæ imagines muliebres affabre sculptæ et bene servatæ erant, quarum alteri titulus *A*, alteri *B* appositus. Una ed. Hessel. Append. ad Præf. Inscr. Gud. c. 13. minusculis Egmond et Heyman Itin. Tom. I. p. 79. diviso tamen utroque titulo, Pocock. Inscr. ant. P. I. 3. 4. p. 38. n. 2. et 3. ex schedis alienis. Horstianæ" (I presume the same VAN DER HOORST whom Dr. TODD has mentioned) "schedæ exhibent ut Hesselius: habeo etiam ex Sherardianis, p. 75. ex quibus liquet utrumque titulum esse in eodem lapide."

This is followed by tit. *A*, or that of Thelymítres, which Böckh commences with reading $\overline{\text{ΚΛ}}$, and expands accordingly into **ΚΛΩΔΙΑΝ**. The uncouth choristic mark which follows, he re-

POSTSCRIPT.

Page 114, note (||).—The deification of the younger Faustina has been here sustained on the presumption, that certain lines of the second Triopeian inscription, which FIORILLO has published amongst his remains of the Orator Heródes,* refer to her; an opinion sanctioned by the authorities not only of FIORILLO himself, but also of VISCONTI, EICHSTÄDT, JACOBS, and BöCKH.† Maturer consideration, however, has, since I composed this note and the sentence in the context on which it is a commentary, induced me to alter this opinion in favour of that of FRANZ, the learned continuator of the “Corpus Inscriptionum,” who has published both Triopeian inscriptions in his third Fasciculus, and has given his readers a condensed statement of the arguments by which HEYSE has substantiated the views of ARNALDUS, namely, that the sixth and forty-eighth lines of the second refer to Galeria Faustina, not to her daughter.‡

In effect, the first of these passages (which, in the titulus itself, proceeds as follows; ΘΕΑΙ . ΔΕ . ΜΙΝ . ΟΥΡΑΝΙΩΝΑ[Ι] . ΤΙΟΥCΙΝ . ΔΗΩ . ΤΕ . ΝΗ . ΔΗΩ . ΤΕ . ΠΑΛΑΙΗ), implies the welcome given to the statue of Regilla into the Triopeian fane by two deities, the new and the old Ceres (Δηώ), both of whom are termed “Celestial,” from which the inference is clear, that the former must have become entitled to this appellation antecedently to that reception. Now, as we are certain from the forty-eighth verse, ΤΟΥΤΟ . ΔΕ . ΦΑΥCΤΕΙΝΗ .

ceives as “siglum decurtatis vocibus addi solitum quaecunque.” He then, in tit. B., or that of Attikós, reads ΜΥΗΣΙΗΝ.

No restoration of this epigraph has been proposed by BöCKH: on the contrary, he seems to have regarded it as hopeless; for he adds, “Hæc intelligi nequeunt.” He concludes with identifying τὴν νέαν Μυησίην πόλιν, as has been done under one of the heads of my Second Section, with Neápolis of Ionía.

The reader will perceive from the foregoing statement, that the labours of the learned German have been such as by no means to supersede the exertions of a successor in this inquiry.

* Vide Dobson's “Oratores Attici,” Tom. iv. pp. 555. ss.

† Ibid. p. 604. not. 4., p. 624. not. 1. Franz, C. I. Tom. iii. n. 6280. B. 6. p. 921. Col. b.

‡ Ibid. p. 922. Vide supr. p. 157. note (‡).

ΚΕΧΑΡΙCΜΕΝΟΝ . ΗCΤΑΙ . ΑΓΑΛΜΑ, that this "New Ceres" must have been a "Faustina," we are constrained to select the consort of Pius, as her daughter had survived Annia Regilla by several years. It is true, that of the exact date of the latter's decease we possess no certain evidence, but satisfactory reasons have been given by FRANZ for referring that event to the last year of Antoninus Pius, that is, U. C. 914. A. D. 161., in which he has corrected the statement of HEYSE, who had assigned 917. 164. as a proximate date. We know, moreover, that the date in the instance of Galeria Faustina was 894. 141., and in that of Annia, 929. 176.*

The inference to which these considerations lead us is fully borne out by the testimony of Medals, in which the first of these Augustæ is represented under the similitude of Ceres,† whereas (as was most natural), the goddess-effigies of the latter were those of the *Kόρη*, or Proserpina.‡

These remarks are added solely with a view to accuracy of statement, but not as in any wise affecting the argument which I have prosecuted in the section to which they refer. This, on the contrary, has its force rather enhanced by any fact which serves to prove that the consort of Caracalla stood alone in the attribution to her, during her life-time, by the Greek communities, of a goddess-name so peculiarly appropriate to the circumstances of the Ionian Neápolis. Alone, I mean, amongst the Augustæ of her age.

Page 121, note (**).—This clause refers to the "Jus Civitatis," and the necessity of those entitled to such being enrolled in the Censors' books under a specific Gentilitial designation. It is limited, moreover, to the cases of the "Græci et Exteri;" for the "Socii et Fœderati," who possessed, in common with the Romans, such designations of their own, were accustomed to preserve them unchanged. The example of Cornelius Balbus, a native of Gades, in defence of whose right, conferred by Pompeius Magnus, Cicero pleaded so eloquently, may be cited in proof of this: for we do not find that in consequence of this act he assumed the Gentilitial name of his benefactor: on the contrary, he preserved his

* ECKHEL dates this event a year earlier, making the numbers 928. 175. Doctr. N.V. Tom. vii. p. 76. a.

† Comp. Vaillant, Num. Imp. Rom. T. ii. p. 167. Eckhel, ubi supra, p. 38. b.

‡ Vide Mionnet, Descr. des Med., etc., T. ii. p. 542. n. 192. Supplem. T. v. p. 326. n. 279.

designation as a citizen of a federated state unaltered.* But the case of Theophanes the Mitylenæan was different. He also was a friend of the same illustrious commander, to whom he had rendered signal service as the historian of his achievements; and he had his reward in being declared by Pompeius, in full military assembly, a Roman citizen.† Accordingly we find, that he assumed the Nomen "Pompeius," which, as we learn from Tacitus‡ and Strabo, became permanent in his family.

My next instance is familiar to all; that of the Antiochian Greek, whose name has been immortalized by Cicero, and who bore the Nomen "Licinius," which appertained to the eminent Roman§ to whom he owed his distinction: and the same Cicero has informed us of Demétrios Mégas, on whom the "Jus Civitatis" had been conferred by Cæsar at the instance of Dolabella; "qua in re," adds the Orator, "ego interfui. Itaque nunc P. Cornelius vocatur,"|| both which had appertained to his son-in-law.

The cases also of the Greeks whom Verres had, by an abuse of his privilege, raised to the position of Roman citizens, the better to qualify them for acting as his instruments in his system of spoliation, may be cited, as Cicero has not failed to use them as the ground of one of his most stinging invectives against their employer: "Ingerebat iste Artemidorum Cornelium medicum, Valerium præconem, Tlepoleum pictorem, et ejusmodi recuperatores: quorum civis Romanus nemo erat, sed Græci sacrilegi, jam pridem improbi, repente Corneli,"** thus crowning his epithets with the Gentilicium of his enemy.

The last example which I shall adduce approaches more nearly to the time with which we have been hitherto conversant. It is that of an Attic of the dêmos Kephale, on whom the "Jus Civitatis" had been conferred by Commodus, as a titulus informs us which ΡΥΚΙΟΥ †† has cited as follows: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙ . ΚΑΙ . ΚΟΡΗΙ . Η . ΙΕΡΑ . ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑ . Μ . ΑΥΡΗΛΙΟΝ . ΛΙΘΟΦΟΡΟΝ . ΠΡΟΣΔΕ

* Vide Orat. pro Balbo, passim.

† Comp. Orat. pro Archia, x., pro Balbo, xxv. Epist. ad Attic. II. 5., VIII. 7. Strabo. XIII. 2.

‡ Annal. VI. 18. fin. See the passage in Strabo referred to in the foregoing note.

§ Viz. Crassus. Vide Le Clerc's "Indicc. ad Cicer." in Lemaire's Edition, pp. 541. 570.

|| Epist. ad Divv. XIII. 36.

** Orat. in Verrem. II. 3. 28. Ed. Lemaire, 1827.

†† Vide Animadvv. in Tacit. p. 335. Comp. Fabretti. Inscriptt. Antiq. Explic. p. 439.

**ΚΤΟΝ . ΠΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ . ΚΕΦΑΛΗΘΕΝ . ΠΡΕΣΒΕΥΣΑΝΤΑ . ΠΡΟΙΚΑ . ΤΙΜΗ
ΘΕΝΤΑ . ΔΕ . ΥΠΟ . ΘΕΟΥ . ΚΟΜΜΟΔΟΥ . ΤΗΙ . ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ . ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑΙ**

κ. τ. ἐξ. Here no doubt can be entertained of the Roman designation of *Prósdekto*s having been synchronous with the distinction conferred upon him by the Augustus to whom we know that it appertained; and as little, that the name and fore-name of the family of the Marathonian Attikoί, of whom so frequent mention has been made in the second section, originated in a similar way, that is, from the nomination of an ancestor to the rank of Roman citizenship by the successor of Augustus; or, perhaps, to speak more correctly, by the son of the elder Drusus, who succeeded Caligula.*

I might illustrate this usage by citing examples, in addition to the foregoing, without limit, but confine myself to two, in consideration of the rank of the personages concerned. The first is, that of Rhœmetálkes I., the Thracian king, who is designated **C. IVLIVS** in a titulus which FABRETTI has published,† whence **IVLIA . TYNDARIS**, his daughter. The second refers to Agrippa I., the grandson of Heródes Magnus, who, in one of SPON's inscriptions cited by the same FABRETTI,‡ is denominated **ΙΟΥΛΙΟΣ**, and also his daughter Bereníke, **ΙΟΥΛΙΑ**. These designations clearly point to the source from which the honour of citizenship was, in each case, derived. We may safely attribute the boon to Augustus.

Page 136, note (†).—In connexion with this note, the reader is recommended to consult PIERRE PETIT's work, entitled, "*Traité Historique sur les Amazones*," à Leide, 1718. This writer has warmly espoused the affirmative side of the question, viz., that the accounts given us by Heródotos, etc., respecting this singular community, contain authentic history. I may refer, more particularly, to chapters VI. and VIII., as also to those which treat of the cities that either historians and geographers, or medals, particularize as founded by Amazons, namely, XXX.—XXXVI.

As to the origin of the name "*Amazón*," he has contented himself with a few brief notices of the Greek étyma in chapters XIV., XXII., to which no scholar now attributes any weight.

* Vide supra, p. 154. The designation of the former of these Augusti in coins ceased to be "*Tiberius Claudius*" in the year U. C. 757., whereas the latter is always so styled. Vide Eckhel, VI. pp. 184. a. and 235. ss.

† Ubi supra.

‡ Vide p. 440. This will be found given in a more correct form by Böckh, Tom. I. n. 361. p. 431.

SECTION IV. a.

I HAVE selected for notice on the present occasion two inscriptions from the island of Pátmos, neither of which has as yet, so far as I have been enabled to learn, found a place in any published collection of Greek tituli. Even the very comprehensive and elaborate work by BöCKH contains no mention of them, nor indeed of any epigraphic memorial, properly so styled, of Pátmos, his only two inscriptions from thence being sepulchral, of the briefest and most ordinary kind, and wholly destitute of any ethnical denomination.* Such, it will be observed, is not the case with those to which I am about to solicit the attention of my auditory; for the notices in both are essentially Patmian, and transport the reader at once to Patmian ground. In their condition, it is true, they appear to some disadvantage, as compared with the jejune epitaphs of CLARKE, the marbles from which they have been copied having sustained injuries so grievous as almost to set at nought the perspicuity of the decipherer, be he ever so experienced or acute. I have not, however, permitted myself to be deterred by considerations of this kind, and have accordingly judged it proper to allow them, were it only for the solemn associations which are connected with this site, a foremost position amongst the insular Ionian† inscriptions which I collected during my travels, few or none whereof have as yet been presented to the learned public.

The titulus with which I commence includes, beside the euphematic formulas at the beginning and end, fourteen lines in the Elegiac verse, evidently the composition of a writer who had attained no slight proficiency in the employment of the poetic language. The dialect which he has selected is, as might naturally be anticipated, the Ionic; his theme, "The eulogy of Pátmos," embodied in a series of mythical notices respecting Ártemis, as connected with whom we observe it to be designated in the seventh verse "the isle of the Letoíás." The first four verses commemorate her selection of Kydalíme, the daughter of Glaukías, to officiate as her priestess, to whom she confided the guardianship of the sacred fire, as also the performance of duties connected with her sacrificial

* Corp. Inscr. T. II. p. 217. nn. 2261. s. from Clarke, *Travels*, vol. III. pp. 372. s. 4to. edit.

† I follow here ECKHEL's classification in his *Doctr. N. V.* vol. II. p. 567. a.

rites. In the fifth and sixth she is recorded as having befriended and nursed Áres; to which succeeds the mention of his nurture during his age of puberty, the praise whereof is awarded to Pátmos. The commemoration of this leads to a notice, in the seventh and eighth verses, of the mythical origin ascribed to the island, namely, that it had emerged by the power of Ártemis from the depths of the sea, in which it had originally lain.

This statement will, doubtless, appear to the geological reader of some interest; more particularly when the vicinity of Asia Minor, so celebrated as a seat of volcanic phenomena, is considered: yet a philosopher of this class will not be slow of perceiving how unlikely it was to have been founded in traditional notices.

The remainder of the composition adds some other incidents to the number of those with which classical readers have been so long familiar in the Oresteia; the semi-fabulous narratives of the fortunes of Oréstes. The fugitive Matricide is described, in the ninth and tenth lines, as having founded in Pátmos an Eri-nyeion, or temple dedicated to the worship of the Erinýes, from whose vengeance, consequent on the perpetration of his unnatural crime, he had so grievously suffered. The result of this act of piety is recorded in the eleventh and twelfth lines, namely, his having experienced the kind and hospitable regards of the Father of Glaukías, acting in obedience to the will of the Skythian Ártemis, which probably had been communicated to him by the exile himself. The titulus then concludes with an account of the hero's crossing the Ikarian sea, and consummating his former act of devotion by celebrating the Órgia, that is, the rites of the Erinýes, with all the requisite solemnities.

It appears from this analysis of our epigraph, that the Oresteia current in Pátmos agreed with the dramatic narrative of Euripídes in an essential point, namely, the agency of the Tauric Ártemis. Classical readers are aware that this constitutes the distinctive feature of his "Iphigéneia amongst the Taûroi," as compared with the Eumenídes of his predecessor, wherein the decision of the Court of the Areiópagos is made final. The former carries on the action still farther by his representing some of the Erinýes, who were dissatisfied with the proceedings, as still continuing their persecution of the culprit; which obliged him to have recourse once more to the Delphic oracle. This forms the ground-

work of the drâma of Euripides. A voice issues from the Delphic Tripod, warning him to repair to the Tauric Artemision, and abstract from its shrine the Image of the goddess, by depositing which in Athênai he could only hope to be finally liberated from his tormentors. The hero himself relates the issue of his appeal:*

Ἐντεῦθεν αὐδὴν τρίποδος ἐκ χρυσοῦ λακῶν
 Φοῖβός μ' ἔπεμψε δεῦρο, διοπετὲς λαβεῖν
 Ἀγαλμ', Ἀθηνῶν τ' ἐγκαθάρῃσαι χθονί.

We learn from the poet, at the close of his drâma, that this injunction was obeyed, and that the result of the attempt was successful. It remains that I should explain the manner in which I connect it with the epigraph now before us.

I suppose that the principal actors in the drâma had taken Pátmos in their course homewards, and that Oréstes, with the Image in his possession, and directed by the same counsel which had commissioned the sire of Glaukias to administer relief to him, proceeded on his arrival to the performance of the duty mentioned in the ninth verse: that this was followed by a partial alleviation of his torments; that his crossing the Ikarian sea had reference to his executing the commands of Apóllon respecting the Image, preliminary to his final reconciliation to the avenging goddesses, and that this result is implied in the concluding verse.

Such is the view which I have been led to form after repeated studies of the titulus before us. The details to which I now proceed will sufficiently prove the difficulty of extricating a clear and consistent sense throughout, more especially from the part which relates to Oréstes, the entire of which had sustained injuries so grave as to appear to me at first sight to preclude all attempts at restoration.

This marble had, in all probability, served as a pedestal to a statue of Ártemis. It lay in the vicinity of the church of St. John (τοῦ ἁγίου Θεολόγου), and consequently of the grotto in which, as tradition asserts, he wrote the Apokalypse. It seems by no means improbable, that the Erinýes had a sanc-

* Iphigén. in Taur. 976. ss.

tuary there in the earlier times of Ethnical superstition ; nay, that it is the identical site to which the composer of these lines has alluded when recording the piety of their victim in the ninth, thirteenth, and fourteenth lines : for the classical student is well aware how usual it was amongst the ancient Greeks to appropriate natural grottoes to the rite-worship of these imaginary impersonations of their mythology. It is equally true, however, that Ártemis had her grottoes also, as a silvan goddess and chaste queen of the nymphs ; and it may be, that this marble attests the existence, at a former period, of a temple dedicated to her worship in our present locality . . . an Artemísion of the Patmians.

All this is, however, pure conjecture, which has the epigraph before us alone to rest upon for any probability which may attach to it ; for in information relating to the myths of Pátmos antiquity is to the last degree jejune ; a fact which stamps these verses with a proportionably higher degree of interest, and the only fact, independently of the merits of the composition, which does so, as it can advance no claim to a very high order of antiquity. The quaint outlines and occasional colligations of its letters bespeak for it a Græco-Roman origin, but yet one prior to the age of Septimius Severus. Were I to hazard a conjecture as to its comparative date, I should pronounce it to be co-ordinate in age, as it certainly appears to have been in intent, with the Ephesian tituli which I had the honour to submit some years since, on my return from the East, to the notice of the Academy ;* and that one of these, at least, was not prior to the time of Hadrian I feel confident. The style, moreover, of the composition, and the forms of certain letters, unite in proving that its date precedes, as I have already mentioned, the reign of Severus. We cannot, therefore, err very far from the truth in attributing it to the period of the Antonini.

As to the intent of this composition, I may safely reiterate the opinion which I advanced before in the instance of the Ephesian tituli,† namely, that it was an effort on the part of some literary Demétrios to prop up the fabric of Gentilism, which was fast tottering to its fall beneath the mild, but earnest, aggression of the primitive missionaries of our Faith : and if this be so, he has

* Vide Transactions, etc., vol. XIX., P. 2. pp. 122. ss.

† Ibid. p. 126.

unquestionably proved himself to have been a master of his "craft," by an appeal so awakening to long-cherished associations.

I proceed now to offer such critical and explanatory remarks as I have deemed requisite to the elucidation of this epigraph, firstly, exhibiting it as nearly as possible in the form which it presented on the monument, and then in what I conceive to have been its original state, as expressed in the subjoined literal version. I have reserved the Greek supplements for their proper places as headings to the appended Notes, in which I shall lay before the reader the successive stages of my transcriptions from the marbles, and then cite authorities on behalf not only of the restorations which I have effected, but also of the author's choice of poetical expressions.

ΑΓΑΘΗ ΤΥΧΗ

ΑΥΤΗΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΚΕΛΑΦΗΒΟΛΟΣΑΡΗΤΕΙΡΑΝ
 ΘΗΚΑΤΟΚΥΔ_Λ_ΜΗ_ΓΛΑΥΚΙΕΩΟΥΓΑΤΡΑ
 ΠΥΡΦΟΡΟΝΕΝ_Α_ΠΑΤΗΙΗΠΑΡΑΒΟΜΙΑΡΕΣΑΙ
 ΣΠΑΙΡΟΝΤΗΔΑΙΓΕΝΕΝΒΡΥΑΚΑΛΛΙΟΥΤΩΝ
 ΑΡΕΙΔ-ΤΕΦ...ΗΝΑΡΤΕΜΙΣΗΔΕΤΙΘΗΗ
 ΕΞΕΙ-ΣΔΗΒΗ_ΕΚΤΡΟΦΟΣΕΣΤΠΠΑΤΗΟΣ
 ΗΗΣΣΟΣΑΝΥ...ΤΑΗΛΗΤ-ΑΔΟΣΗΠΤΡΟΒΕΒΗΚΕ
 ΙΙΕΝΘΕΣΙΝ-Η---ΙΣΤ---ΝΑΡΥΟΜΕΝΗΙ
 ΕΡΙΗ...ΔΙΘ...ΝΑΛΗΙΟΣΕΙΣΕΝΟΡΕΣΤΗΣ
 ΣΤ_Μ_ΦΥΓΕΗΣΜΗΤΡΟΦΟΝΟΥΜΑΝΙΗΣ
 ΔΕΙ.....ΠΑΤΗΡΣΟΦΟΥΗΤΗΡΟΣ
 ΓΛΑΥΚΙΕΩ...ΙΣΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΟΣΣΚΥΘΙΗΣ
 ΑΙΤΑΙ_ΟΥΠΛΩΣ_ΚΑΡ_ΟΥΔΥΣΧΕΙΜΕΡΟΙΔΜΑ
 ΟΡΓΙΑΘΑΛ.....ΩΣΘΕΜΙΣΗΓΛΑΙΣΕΝ
 ΕΥΤΥΧΩΣ

- “ The Huntress-Virgin by her own act constituted
 Kydalíme, the daughter of Glaukías, her priestess,
 With the charge of her sacrificial fire, to offer in the Patmian land her altar-victims,
 And the younglings of duly sacrificed goats writhing in the death-pang.
- 5 To Áres, moreover, was Ártemis a friend and nurse ;
 But to Pátmos is due the nurture of his succeeding youth ;
 Isle most arid of the daughter of Letó, by whose agency, amidst the marine depths,
 Drawing it forth it originally emerged to light.
 Here it was that Oréstes, destitute wanderer, founded a shrine to the Erinýes,
- 10 What time he fled the maddening sting of his matricidal frenzy ;
 And here, that the Sire of the skilled physician Glaukías administered to his need,
 In compliance with the behests of the Skythian Ártemis :
 And here, in due time, after his navigating the tempestuous surge of the Ikarian main,
 That, bearing the olive-branch, he solemnized the rites of the Erinýes with befitting
 pomp.”

My auditory will be at no loss, with the aid of the foregoing details, to estimate the value of this fragmentary memorial of Pátmos. It is replete, as I have already observed, with traditional information from the commencement to the end ; apprizing us of what we should in vain search for in the standard remains of Hellenic literature, whether European or Asiatic. The prevalence of the Artemisiac worship in Pátmos, and then the more distinctly expressed relation which subsisted between this island and the object of its worship, suggest a favourable comparison with the far-famed Dêlos, the sacred territory of her ‘Ομογάστριος. The singular retrospect which is presented to us of the epoch when Pátmos, emerging from the abyss of waters by the might of its Tutelary, first saw the light, continues the parallel ; for Dêlos also claimed a like origin through the instrumentality of Poseidôn.* The right which is then asserted in favour of the isle, one doubtless perpetuated in the heroic legends of its citizens, to be considered as the scene of the reconciliation of the royal fugitive to his avenging persecutors, appears rival of the pretensions of Trœzén,† Áke,‡ and even Dêlphoí.§ All these, so circumstantially detailed as to present the aspect of historical facts, are unexpected additions to our store of Hellenic

* Vid. *infra*, p. 204. note (§) Postscript, and p. 205. note (†).

† Pausan. ii. 31. 7, 11.

‡ Ibid. viii. 34. 2.

§ Eumenídes, 64. 473. ss.

myths, and serve to enhance our regret that more such legendary notices have not rewarded the labours of the traveller and the classical archæologist.

I proceed now to my critical and exegetical notices, in my arrangement of which I shall be directed by the periods of the epigraph, which severally commence with the first, fifth, and ninth verses.

Αὐτὴ Παρθενικὴ ἑλαφηβόλος ἀρήτειραν
Θήκατο Κυδαλίμην, Γλαυκίῳ θυγάτρα,
Πυρφόρον, ἐν γαίῃ Πατνίῃ παραβώμια ῥέξαι,
Σπαίροντ' ἥδ' αἰγῶν ἔνβρυα καλλιθύτων.

1. Αὐτὴ κ. τ. ἐξ. My first copy of this line was, ΑΥΤΗΠΑΡΘΕΝΙ_ΗΕΛΑΦΗ ΡΑ°ΣΑΡΗΤΕΙΑΝ; my second, ΑΥΗΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΚΗΕΛΑΦΗΒ°Λ°ΣΑΡΗΤΕ_ΡΑΝ. The use of Παρθενικὴ for Παρθένος was frequent amongst the poets: but, properly speaking, it was the feminine of Παρθενικός with κόρη subauded. Compare the following passages: Homer, Πιάς:* Παρθενικαί τε καὶ ἡῖθεοι, ἀταλὰ φρονέοντες. Odys. :† Παρθενικαί τ' ἀταλαὶ νεοπενθέα θυμὸν ἔχουσαι. Hým. :‡ Παρθενικαί τε χοροῖς εὐανθέσιν εὐφρονι θυμῷ Παίζουσαι σκαίρουσι. Euripides:§ Πᾶσαι δὲ παρ' ἥραν μέλλουσι παρθενικαὶ στείχειν. Theókr. :|| Παρθενικαὶ θάλλοντα κόμῃς ὑάκινθον ἔχουσαι.

The epithet ἑλαφηβόλος is sanctioned by Homer, Hým. :** * Ἀρτεμιν αἰίδω χρυσηλάκατον, κελαδεινήν, Παρθένον αἰδοίην, ἑλαφηβόλον, ἰοχέαιραν. Πιάς:†† *Ὀι ῥά θ' ὑπὸ σκύμνους ἑλαφηβόλος ἀρπάσῃ ἀνὴρ. Also by Sophoklēs:‡‡ Βοᾶτε τὰν ὁμόσπορον Ἀρτεμιν ὀρτυγίαν, ἑλαφηβόλον. Its synonym from κτείνω appears in Euripides:§§ *Ἐνθα τᾶς ἑλαφοκτόνου Θεᾶς ἀμφίπολον κούραν Παῖδ' ἀγαμεμνονίαν λατρεύω. Another in Pausanías,||| where he observes of the people of Elis; *Ἐλαφιαίαν δ' ἐκάλουν οἱ Ἑλεῖοι τὴν Ἀρτεμιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐλάφων (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν) τῇ θήρᾳ. The Eleians, however, accounted differently for this epithet.

From ἑλαφηβόλος were formed ἑλαφηβολία, ἑλαφηβολία, and the name of the ninth month of the Athenian year, ἑλαφηβολιών. Thus in Kallimachos

* σ'. 567.

† λ'. 39.

‡ Α. 14.

§ Eléctra. 173. s.

|| Eidýll. xviii. 2.

** KZ. i. s.

†† σ'. 319.

‡‡ Trachin. 214. ss.

§§ Iphig. in Taur. 1120. ss.

||| vi. 22. 5. fin.

we read,* *Μηδ' ἐλαφηβολίην μηδ' εὐστοχίην ἐριδαίνειν*. Plutarch acquaints us with the origin of the *Ἐλαφηβόλια*, a Phokian festival in honour of *Ἄρτεμις Ἐλαφηβόλος*, in the following clause:† *Ἐορτήν δ' ἐκ πασῶν μεγίστην τὰ Ἐλαφηβόλια μέχρι νῦν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῆς νίκης ἐκείνης ἐν Ὑαμπόλιδι τελοῦσιν*. A similar observance originated the name of the Attic month.

Ἀρήτεια is the feminine noun corresponding to *Ἀρητήρ*, of which Apollonios furnishes an example:‡ *τῷ δὲ ξύμβλητο γεραιῇ Ἰφιάς, Ἀρτέμιδος πολιηόχου ἀρήτεια*.

2. *Κυδαλίμην*. First copy: **ΟΝΚΑΤΟΚΥΕΙΗ – ΑΜΗ – ΓΜΚΤΕΩ**; second, **ΘΗΚΑΤΟΚΥΔ – – – – ΜΥΚΙΕΩ**. In my first restored form I had inserted *Κυδίππην* as the proper name in consequence of its appearing in connexion with the Artemisiac worship in these parts of Greece in Kallimachos,§ Aristainetos,|| and Ovid,** to whom the loves of Kydippe and the youth Akontios have supplied materials of highly-wrought description. My final transcript, however, exhibits *Κυδαλίμην*, which I have retained as, on the whole, more in accordance with the marble. I have met the name elsewhere.

3. *Πυρφόρον*. First copy: **ΠΙΡΦΟΡΟΝΕΙΠΑΝΤ – ΗΙΗΚΑΙΑΡΝΙΑΡΕΞΝΙ**: second: – **ΡΦΟΡΟΝΕΙΠΑΝΤΙΠΙΗΠΑΡΑΒΟΝΙΑΡΕΞΑΙ**: third: – **ΥΑΡΟΦΟΡΟΝΗ ΝΑΠΑΤΝΙΗΠΑΡΑΒΟΜΙΑΡΕΞΑΙ**. The central portion of this verse had been exceedingly injured: but *Πατνίη* having been elicited from the marble, *ἐν γαίῃ* followed of course.

Kydalime appears to have combined in her own person the distinct offices of *πυρφόρος*, guardian of the sacrificial fire, and *παραβωμία*, attendant on the altar. We find these classed separately in Lucian:†† *Ἱρέες δὲ αὐτοῖσι πολλοὶ ἀποδεδέχεται· τῶν οἱ μὲν τὰ ἱρήϊα σφάζουσι, οἱ δὲ σπονδὴν φορέουσι, ἄλλοι δὲ πυρφόροι καλέονται, καὶ ἄλλοι παραβώμιοι*.

The *Pyrphoros* in the Spartan state was a person of very high consideration.‡‡ His presence was indispensable in all expeditions of the King, and his person was accounted sacrosanct; insomuch, that the expression *ἔδει δὲ*

* III. 262.

† De mulier. virtut. III. fin.

‡ Argonaut. A'. 311. s.

§ Tom. I. pp. 305. ss. Edit. Spanh.

|| Epist. I. 10. p. 22. Ed. Abresch.

** Heroid. Epp. XX. XXI.

†† De Syria dea, XLII.

‡‡ Vid. Xenoph. De rep. Laced. XIII. 2.

μηδὲ πυρφόρον περιγενέσθαι* was synonymous with the total discomfiture and rout of an army.

Again; we find it applied to Deméter, who is termed πυρφόρος,† but in a different, namely, a mythical sense.

Ibid. 'Ρέξαι. That is, *ιερά*, the Latin "*sacra facere*." The readers of Homer and Hesiod may derive abundant illustration of this expression from their writings.‡ We may cite, however, on account of the word with which it is immediately accompanied, the verse from the *Análekta*;§ 'Ρέξει καλλιθυτῶν κάπρον ὀρειονόμον. Here καλλιθυτέω corresponds in meaning to καλλιέρειω,|| the Latin "*lito*," "*perlito*." So also καλλίθυτος, from which comes the epithet at the close of the next verse, καλλιθύτων, unless we prefer to render it agreeably to its meaning, "*sacrificed in due form*." Thus the victims offered by Aineías** were καλλίθυτα, of whom it is said, "*Centum lanigeras mactabat rite bidentes*." Hence the βωμοί were termed καλλίθυτοι to which such offerings were con-signed,†† supposing this reading to be sanctioned by the passage in question.

4. Σπαίρουτ' ἡδ' αἰγῶν κ. τ. ἐξ. First copy; – ΠΑΙΡΟΝΤΗΛΙΓΩΚΕΝΙΠΡΥΑ ΚΑΜΘΥΤΩΝ: second; – ΠΑΙΡΟΝΤΗΝΤΩΝ – – ΠΡΥΑΚΑΛΛΘΥΤΩΝ: third; ΣΠΑΙΡΟΝΤΗΝΑΙΓΩΝΕΝΒΡΥΑΚΑΜΙΘΥΤΩΝ.

The verb σπαίρω is Homeric,‡‡ as also is its euphonic synonym ἀσπαίρω, which the Attic dialect received. I cite the following passage from Euripídes, as illustrative of the present: §§ "Ελαφος γὰρ ἀσπαίρουσ' ἔκειτ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ 'Ιδεῖν μεγίστη, διαπρεπής τε τήν θέν, "Ἦς αἵματι βωμὸς ἐραίνεται ἄρδην τῆς θεοῦ.

"Εμβρυα (here written ἐνβρυα) means νεογνά. Thus we read in the *Odysseia*:||| "Εξόμενος δ' ἤμελγεν οἷς καὶ μηκάδας αἶγας, Πάντα κατὰ μοῖραν, καὶ ὑπ' ἐμβρυον

* Heródot. viii. 6. See Wesseling's note.

† Euripíd. Supplic. 271.

‡ Comp. Iliád. κ'. 292. Theogon. 417.

§ Tom. ii. 224.

|| Comp. Xenoph. de rep. Laced. xiii. 2. s. Demosth. adv. Makártat. p. 1072. l. 17. Heródot. vi. 76. Theókr. Eidýll. v. 148.

** Æneid. vii. 93.

†† Thus Passow, B. i. p. 1165. b. "*καλλίθυτος βωμός*, Altar, der schöne Opfergaben empfängt, auf dem schöne opfer dargebracht werden." The same exégesis is given also in STEPHANUS, who refers to Euripídes as his authority, but this is incorrect. For "*Euripid*," read "*Epigr*." Vide "Postscript."

‡‡ Iliád. ν'. 571. See (for ἀσπαίρω) γ'. 293.

§§ Iphig. in Aul. 1587. ss.

||| Vid. ι'. 245. s.

ἦκεν ἐκάστη. This immolation of goats and their young to Ártemis, which we know to have been customary also amongst the Athenians, we may suppose to have originated in the impersonation which entitled her to be addressed by the poet as τὸ λαμπρὸν εἰλίσσουσ' ἐν εὐφρόνῃ φάος.* So also, perhaps, the myth of Arkadia, which Virgil has borrowed from the Georgiká of Níkandros.† Passow adverts to the language of the Mysteries with respect to Ártemis in the following words: "Spätere Dichter haben ihren Mythos sehr mannigfach behandelt, und ihn besonders mit den mystischen und nächtlichen Göttinnen, Selene, Hekate, Eileithyia u. a. in Verbindung gebracht."‡ It is highly probable, that the autonomous coins of Sámos,§ which present on their obverses the head of the goddess Méne|| with the accompanying "lunula," afford an example of this "union;" and that we are to explain in the same way the epithet ἀμφίπυρος, attributed to Ártemis in a passage cited above from the Trachiníai,** which we may collect from the Scholiast†† to have proceeded from the Mysteries.

5. Ἄρεϊ δέ τε φίλη ἦν Ἄρτεμις, ἥδὲ τιθήνη
 Ἐξείης δ' ἥβης ἔκτροφός ἐστι Πάτνος
 Νήσσοις ἀνδροτάτη Λητωάδος, ἥ προβέβηκε
 Βένθεσιν εἰναλίοις τὸ πρὶν ἀρνομένη.

5. Ἄρεϊ. First copy; **ΝΑΡΕΙΔΕΤΕΙΦΗΝΑΡΗΠ_Σ**: second; **ΑΡΙΔΕΤΙΦΗ**: third; **ΑΡΕΙΔΕΤ_...Η**. The remainder of the line was sufficiently plain.

I have given above the result of my study of this verse, which the very imperfect notices that remained on the marble rendered it extremely difficult to decipher. It assigns to Ἄρες a Nurse and a Nurturer very different from those which the standard authorities have given to him: but it must be owned, that the πολίλοχος, the ἵπποσόα, the ἰοχέαιρα, the goddess "with the armour and belt of gold," †† was selected with great judgment to fulfil this important duty.

* Iphig. in Aul. 1570. Vide "Postscript."

† Vid. Georgik. III. 391. ss. Macrob. Saturnal. v. 22.

‡ Ubi supr. p. 325. b.

§ Eckhel, Doctr. etc. vol. II. pp. 568. s.

|| We find this deity identified with Seléne in the Homeric Hymn, AB. 1.

** Vide p. 196.

†† Viz., Παρ' ὅσον ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς χερσὶ δαδουχεῖ. T. I. Ed. Brunck. Lond. p. 295.

†† Kallímach. Hým. III. 110. s. Ἄρτεμι παρθενίη, τιτυοκτόνε, χρύσεια μὲν τοι ἔντεα καὶ ζώνη.

What were the claims of Pátmos to be intrusted with the threpterial office, independently of its connexion with the Τιθήνη, I know not. I conclude, however, that we are to understand it in the same sense with the Naxian myth concerning Diónysos,* and that of the Eleians with respect to Ártemis herself.†

6. 'Εξείης. My copies of the first hemistich were; 1. ΕΚΕΙΕΗΣΒΗΙ. 2. ΕΚΓΕΙΤΗΣΒΗΙ, 3. ΕΚΤΕΙ...ΤΗΣΒΗ... My last was quite distinct.

I submit the choice of two restorations of this word, which had been rendered almost illegible from the condition of the marble, viz., 'Εξῆς τῆς ἡβης, and 'Εξείης δ' ἡβης. The construction of the adverb, which expresses succession in time as well as place, may be either absolute, or with ἡβης, according to the rule of Phavorinus:‡ 'Εξῆς γενικῇ συντάσσεται. Λουκιανός' ἐξῆς τριῶν ἡμερῶν. The alternative which I have preferred in each of these cases will be seen from my version and restored form.

Ibid. *Εκτροφος. This word is unusual, but quite admissible; being formed from τροφός, as ἐκτροφή (of no infrequent occurrence§) from τροφή. We observe τροφός not only in cases wherein we might naturally expect it, but also where we might have anticipated the Attic form, τροφεύς.||

Ibid. Πάτνος, not Πάτμος, as in the third verse, Πατνίη. This mode of writing the name and ethnic supplies a strong argument on behalf of the age which I have assigned to the epigraph before us: as it proves at least its having been composed during the Imperial times. Otherwise, we should unquestionably have had the μ in both. We remark, accordingly, a continuation of the more recent form in the Neo-Hellenic Πάτνο (or Πάτινο), the final consonant being, as usual, retrenched.

7. Νῆσος, in all my transcripts, instead of Νήσος, which also indicates the comparative recency of this titulus. Thus we have observed 'Ασκληπιός written 'Ασσεκληπιός in an inscription which I have cited at the close of my first section.**

* Viz. as brought up by three of its nymphs. Hence Nákos is styled by Solinus, in Polyhist. c. xi. "hospita Libero Patri." Pausanías mentions a similar legend concerning him current amongst the people of Brasíai: iii. 34. 3.

† Vid. Pausan. cit. supr. p. 196.

‡ Vid. Schleusner, in Lexic. N. T. voc. ἐξῆς. Bos, Ellips. Græc. p. 440. fin.

§ Ex. gr. ἐκτροφαὶ καλᾶι, in Eurip. Danáæ, Fr. vi. 5.

|| Vid. Euripíd. Elékt. 409. Herakl. Fur. 45.

** Supr. p. 106.

The epithet which accompanied Νῆσος was copied by me successively ΑΙΑΥ _ _ _ PITH and ΑΙΑΥ _ _ _ TATH, the last of which was evidently ANY _ _ _ TATH in its original state, from which the advance to the restoration ANYΔΡΟΤΑΤΗ is immediate. Truth sanctioned this appellation, which, I confess, appeared to me rather strange and illaudatory in a composition intended as eulogistic of Πάτμος: but its author could not disguise facts, with the scene of drought and barrenness present to his view, which exist in my own recollection; suggesting the spot in the Roman times as adapted to the purposes of a penal settlement, and in modern, presenting little more than a single oasis to redeem it from the imputation of absolute sterility. As a poet, also, he may have judged that the physical contrast might serve to enhance the mythical glories of his isle. He must have known, moreover, that Euripides* has applied the same epithet to the far-famed seat of the Ægyptian god whom the Greeks identified with their Ζεύς: 'Αλλ' οὐδὲ ναυκληρίαν ἔσθ' ὅποι τις αἶας Στείλας ἢ Λυκίας Εἴτ' ἐπὶ τὰς ἀνύδρους Ἀμμωνίδας ἔδρας Δυστάνου παραλύσαι Ψυχάν. A parallel, therefore, may have been implied here in the same spirit in which we shall shortly see another hinted with Δῆλος.

Ibid. Λητωάδος. 1. ΝΑΔΟΣΗΣΤΡΟΒΕΡΗΚΕ: 2. ΙΗΔΟΠΡΟΒΕΒΗΚΕ: 3. ΜΗΤΞΑΔΟΣΠΡΟΒΕΒΗΚΕ. From these the amount of defacement sustained by the monument will be readily inferred.

The metronymics of Ἄρτεμις were, Λητωῖα, Λητωῖς, Λητωῖας, as in Kallimach. Hým. Artém. † Οὐνεκα θυγατέρας Λητωῖδι πέμπεν ἀμορβούς, and Τεύξατε καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Λητωῖας, ὥσπερ Ἀπόλλων. The form used by our poet was unquestionably the last of these, with the Ιῶτα merging in the Ο-μέγα as a subscript, forming Λητωῖας. Thus we find Λητωῖα assuming the form Λητώα in Sophoklēs: ‡ Κάκ' τοῦδε μηνίσασα Λητώα κόρη.

Λητωάδος appeared to have been followed by two letters which my first copy exhibits as ΗΣ, that is, ἦς, "before whom it advanced," to wit, "emerged." I regard ΗΙ, however, as far preferable, with the meaning which I have assigned to it in my version, "through whom," that is, by whose intervention, or agency. Thus Hesíod. § τρηχίνα δέ τοι παρελαύνω Ἐς κήϋκα ἄνακτα· ὁ γὰρ δυνάμει τε καὶ

* Alkest. 112. ss.

‡ Eléktr. 570.

† III. 45. 83.

§ Scut. Herc. 353. ss.

αἰδοῖ Τρηχίνος προβέβηκε, that is, "by" (or "through") "his prowess and modest deportment." The superiority of this restoration will appear more evident from what is stated in the next verse.

8. Βένθεσιν. My copies were: 1. ΙΕΝΔΕΣΙΝ: 2. ΙΕΝΘΕΣΙΝ. The restoration which I have offered may, therefore, be considered as abundantly certain. Then followed: 1. - - - - ΙΣΡΑ - - - - - ΝΑΡΥΟΜΕΝΗΙ: 2. ΑΝ - - - ΗΣΕΔ - - - - - ΝΑΡΥΟΜΕΝΗΓ.

Βένθος was the poetic form of Βάθος, as Πένθος of Πάθος. Εσχ. Πάσαι, ὅσαι κατὰ βένθος ἀλὸς Νηρηΐδες ἦσαν.* Ἀθάνατος Πρωτεύς Αἰγύπτιος, ὃς τε θαλάσσης Πάσης βένθεα οἶδε.† Θοαῖσι μὲν ναυσὶ πόρον Πνοαὶ κατὰ βένθος ἄλιον ἰθύνουσι.‡ The last of these passages suggest, as a fitting restoration here, εἰναλίοις, evidence of which to a certain extent appears in my second copy: ex. Μόναν δὴ μ' ἀχαιοὶ κομίζου=σι σέθεν ἀπ' ὀμμάτων Κνανέαν ἐπὶ ναῦν Εἰναλίοις πλάταις.§ The true supplement, however, may be Ἰκαρίοις, in agreement with our present locality: thus we read in the last verse but one, ῥόου Ἰκαρίου.

The last hemistich has occasioned me no small perplexity. The verb ἀρύω, and its middle, ἀρύομαι, always imply motion upwards;|| unlike its derivative "haurio," which is sometimes used in the sense of "sorbeo."** Accordingly, the true reading cannot be ἀρνομένη, for this we should necessarily connect with the subject of προβέβηκε, that is, Πάτος. It remains, therefore, that we adopt either of two restorations, agreeably to ἦς or ἦ in the preceding verse, namely, ἀρνομένης or ἀρνομένη: and this, moreover, appears to agree better with the marble, which presented traces of a letter after the Η.

The restitution of the word which immediately preceded this can hardly be defined with certainty; but I conclude from the evidence of the copies, that the choice lies between πρόσθεν and τὸ πρῖν. The first of these being an

* Iliad. σ'. 38.

† Odyss. δ'. 385. s.

‡ Euripid. Belleroph. Fr. xx. 2. ss.

§ Id. Troad. 1099. ss.

|| Ex. gr. Hesiod. Opp. et DD. 548. Ὅς τε ἀρυσάμενος ποταμῶν ἀπὸ ἀεναόντων. Arat. Diosem. 14. s. Ἡὲ τέων ἄλλων οἷ τ' ὠκεανοῦ ἀρύονται Ἀστέρες ἀμφιλύκης, οἷ τε πρώτης ἔτι νυκτός.

** Ex. c. Cicer. Philipp. xi. 5. init. "Quid eum non sorbere animo, quid non haurire cogitatione, cujus sanguinem non bibere censetis?" Ovid. Fast. iii. 600. "Puppis, et, expositis omnibus, hausta perit."

adverb both of time and place,* may be constructed prepositionally with ἥς ----- ἀρνομένης, "in presence of whom drawing it forth," or independently, as τὸ πρίν. I have already stated, however, that I think ἥ and ἀρνομένη entitled to our preference, and accordingly, I have rendered the passage and restored it with reference to this reading alone.

It is evident from the age in which the author of these lines wrote, that we must seek the explanation of this remarkable passage from some other source than the science of these latter times, insular or continental formations by the upheaving of the terrestrial crust having been then neither understood nor appreciated. We must, therefore, resort to the writer's language and etymology, not forgetting the impulse of the Greek mind to appropriate to its own vehicle of thought the origins of all designations, whether ethnical, local, or personal, however primarily they may have been unconnected with it. A striking instance of this we have had occasion recently to notice in the instance of the Amazonian community.† That of the Egyptian Ámmon is another case in point, whom a Greek (not Plútarchos) was found hardy enough to hint to have been so named, because his temple stood "beneath the sand-heaps;"‡ Δαεσσι being thus a derivative of ἄμμος!

To come nearer to our present site. It is abundantly evident, that in the territorial designations of Western Asia, and the adjacent islands of the Ægean, which have survived the march of Hellenic conquest, we behold imprinted in legible characters the primitive ascendancy of their nomade rulers. These it was the constant endeavour of the Greeks to efface, partly by adopting, and then disguising them under the inflexions peculiar to their own vernacular; in some cases, by replacing them with its synonyms. I cite two examples illustrative of each of these artifices. Every one is familiar with the term Τύραννος, and knows that it is classical Greek. But the inscriptions of Μαιονία reveal to us the fact, that it primarily existed in the language of that country,§ and

* Ex. c. Iliád. α'. 250. α. Τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων Ἐφθίαθ', οἳ οἱ πρόσθεν ἄμα τράφεν, ἡδ' ἐγένοντο. γ'. 224. Τὸ πρόσθε στέρνοιο φέρων Τελαμώνιος Αἴας.

† Vide note (†), p. 136. *supr.*

‡ Comp. Eustáthios on Dionýs. Perieget. Καὶ τέμενος Λίβυκοῖο θεοῦ ψαμάθω ὑπὸ πολλῇ, cited in Stephan. Dict. Hist. p. 91. a.

§ Comp. Fascic. Inscr. Gr. II. p. 145. n. CLXIII. b.

accordingly we trace it in the Ethnic of its ancient Italian colony, written by the Greeks *Τυρρηνός*. In effect, it was itself an Ethnical appellation, identical, when divested of its Hellenic termination, with the Persian, that is, the Zendic, *توراني*, signifying a native of *توران*, the vast tract of the Asiatic continent, whence issued the early conquerors and princes of the western world.*

I now submit an instance of the second mode, namely, the introduction of a synonymous name. The Greek immigrants into Lykia found its principal river denominated from the colour of the bed over which its waters flowed, "the yellow" (*زرباب*), and by degrees superseded the ancient name by exchanging it for their own *Ξανθος*. This their illustrious geographer has had the candour to acknowledge, by informing us of the vernacular name, clothed, however, in a Greek dress, *Σίρβα*.†

I state these facts as preliminary to my observations respecting our present locality. I feel convinced, that *Πάτμος*, however it may be disguised under its Hellenic form, is a name traceable to a Shemitic root... one designative of a product for which both it and other islands of the *Ægæan* were, and still are, remarkable. I allude to the Terebinthaceæ of botanists, a family which was known to the inhabitants of Syria and Arabia under the respective names of *نخل* and *بطم*, and from which the latter people would naturally denominate our island as *جزيرة البطم*. Consistently with this we find the words in the Apokalypse,‡ *ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ* expressed in the Arabic version, *في جزيرة يقال لها بطمس*, wherein *بطم* has been preserved, the only change which has been made consisting in the addition of the *Sîn* to impart to it the Greek form. The inference from this is, that "*Bátmos*," not "*Pátmos*," is the correct mode of writing the name, and we may be certain, that a Greek who was aware of it would not fail to take advantage of the approximation of the former to the allied nouns *βαθμός*§ and *βάθος* to construct a myth of the island's having

* Amongst the Persian historians *ایران* and *توران* are the designations which comprehend all the higher Asia, with the exception of India and China. Vide Richardson's Dictionary, p. 313. b.

† Vide xiv. 3. *Ὁ Ξάνθος ποταμός, δὲ Σίρβην ἐκάλουν οἱ πρότερον*. It appears evident from this, that *Σίρβα* was the Hellenic euphone for *زرباب*, formed by suppressing the final letter.

‡ Ch. i. v. 9.

§ In reference to this word, which, like *ἀρνομένη*, implies ascent, it may be remarked, that *Pátmos* was not infrequently written *Páthmos*. Thus LEMAIRE remarks on Plin. iv. 23. 3. in note 28.,

been originally submerged in the abyss, from which it was eventually drawn forth by the power of a deity. He might not, it is true, be cognizant of the real *étymon*; but even supposing he were, a true Greek would care very little for that, when the credit of his vernacular was concerned.

There can be little doubt of the names of Rhódos and Dêlos, concerning which myths analogous to this of Pátmos have been invented,* being referrible to a like source: but into further discussions of this kind my limits forbid my entering. The only remark which it is now necessary to offer is, that the author of these lines seems to have been actuated by a desire to assert in all particulars the same amount of claim to mythical renown on behalf of Pátmos which had been conceded to other islands better known to the mythist and the historian. If to Dêlos belonged the honour of being the chosen seat of the worship of the son of Letó, Pátmos could assert a like connexion with her daughter: if Poseidôn could chain the errant member of the Kykládes to the rock,† and give it a place in his domain, so had the virgin-goddess rescued the entombed Ionian isle from the abyss.

“Vet. apud Dalecamp. Pathmos.” Was the close resemblance of this to *βαθμός* the origin of the myth, or was the latter, already existing, the source of the former, in order to approximate it to a presumed *étymon*? Vide “Postscript.”

* Comp. Stephan. Dict. etc. p. 854. a. “Nomen ejus” (i. e. Rhódos) “quod attinet, ita Grammatici: *παρὰ τὸ πολλὸν ῥοῦν αὐτόθι δονεῖσθαι, πρὶν φανῆναι τὴν νῆσον.*” Hemst. ad Lucian. Dial. Marin. x. “Rhodum quoque, cujus et Philo eandem ob causam meminerat, olim infra fluctus depressam *ἀναφανῆναι ὕστερον ξηρανθεῖσαν* Heraclides ait.” Concerning Dêlos, see Lucian. in loc. cit. Strabo, x. 5. Kallímach. H. ad Dêl. Æneid. iii. 73. ss. Thebaid. i. 702. Petron. Fragm. vi. p. 225. Bip.

Bochart has derived the name Rhódos from the Aramæan *רֹדֹס*, supposing an aphæresis of the first letter. This word (Buxtorf. Lexic. p. 238.) signified “a serpent;” and certainly the agreement of this with one of its ancient names, *Ὀφιοῦσσα* (Strab. xiv. 2.), appears singular. Hesychios has explained this, *διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὄφρων*, in corroboration of which we may cite a passage from Diódoros (v. 58. p. m.), *τῆς Ῥοδίας γῆς ἀνείσης ὄφεις ὑπερμεγέθει κ. τ. ἐξ.* The same author informs us also, that the Rhodian cult of Poseidôn originated with Kádmos, which tradition implies a very early connexion between it and the Phœnicians, and thus favours the etymology here stated. Its perversion may, as in the instance of Pátmos, have originated the myth of its emersion from the deep.

† Pindar. in Strab. x. 5. p. 387. Tauch. *Δὴ τότε τέσσαρες ὄρθαι Πρέμνων ἀπώρουσαν χθονίων,*
* *Ἄν' ὅ' ἐπὶ κραναῇ σχέθον Πέτρα δαμαντοπέδιλοι Κίονες.*

'Ενθάδ' 'Ερινύς' ἔδεθλον ἀλήϊος εἶσεν 'Ορέστης,
 10 Οἴστρημ' ὥς φύγεν ἧς μητροφόνου μανίης·
 'Ενδείην δ' οἱ ἄμυνε πατὴρ σοφοῦ ἱητήρος
 Γλαυκίῃ, βουλαῖς 'Αρτέμιδος Σκυθίης·
 Κᾶτα ῥόου πλὺς 'Ικαρίου δυσχείμερον οἶμα
 *Οργια θαλλοφορῶν, ὥς θέμις, ἠγλάϊσεν.

9. 'Ενθάδ' κ. τ. ἐξ. I copied here: 1. - - - TEPIN - - - - - PIOPN,
 2. - - - - ΓΗΝ - - - - - NΘEN, from which it is easy to infer the con-
 dition of the marble, which presented scarcely a trace of the first hemistich.
 Such was also the case in each of the two succeeding lines.

I regard it, however, as past doubt, from the vestige EPIN, that mention of
 the σεμναὶ θεαί had occurred in this verse, as also of a fane dedicated to them by
 Oréstes, from the introduction of εἶσεν towards its close. There remained of
 ἔδεθλον but three elements and part of a fourth: as a restoration, therefore,
 although highly probable, it is by no means so certain. I cite, however,
 the following on its behalf. Pausan.:* Καλοῦσι δὲ 'Ερινῶν οἱ Θελπούσιοι τὴν
 θεὸν (viz. Δήμητρα)· ὁμολογεῖ δὲ σφισι καὶ 'Αντίμαχος ἐπιστρατεῖαν 'Αργείων
 ποιήσας ἐς Θήβας· καὶ οἱ τὸ ἔπος ἔχει· Δήμητρος τόθι φασὶν 'Ερινύος εἶναι ἔδεθλον.
 Kallimach:† Σπάρτη τοι, Καρνείε, τό γε πρῶτιστον ἔδεθλον. Thus also we read
 in a titulus from Philai, published in my third volume;‡ Στάλα ἐνεστάλωσεν, ἵν'
 εἰς τόδε νάσω ἔδεθλον Πᾶς ὁ μολῶν ὑμνῇ τὸν χθονὸς ὀλβοδόταν.

Ibid. 'Αλήϊος. This was very indistinct, but is unquestionably the true
 reading. My first transcripts were; 1. AIIII°Σ: 2. - - HIOΣ: 3. ANHI°Σ. The
 Homeric student will be at no loss for assigning to it its proper meaning, viz.,
 ἐνδείης. Ex. gr. Οὐ κεν ἀλήϊος εἴη ἀνὴρ ᾧ τόσσα γένοιτο. §

Ibid. Εἶσεν. That is, ἔδρυνε. This, and the following proper name, were
 quite distinct on the monument.

From the obsolete ἔζω came the following: εἶσα, εἰσάμην, εἴσομαι, εἶμαι.
 The following are examples of the use of the middle aorist in the sense now
 before us. Theogn.:|| *Αρτεμι θηροφόνῃ, θύγατερ διὸς, ἣν ἀγαμέμνων Εἶσαθ', ὅτ'

* VIII. 25. 3.

† Hým. II. 72.

‡ Fascic. III. p. 187. n. CCCLIX. c. Comp. Lykóphron. 987.

§ Iliád. ι'. 125, 267.

|| Sentent. 12. s. Ed. Gaisford.

ἐς Τροίην ἔπλεε νηυσὶ θααῖς. Heródot.* Τῷ δὲ Λυκούργῳ τελευτήσαντι ἱρὸν εἰσάμενοι σέβονται μέγας.

10. Οἴστημ' ὥς. My first copies of this line were: 1. ----- ΦΥΓΕΝ
- ΜΕΤΡΟΦΟΝ - ΜΑΝΙΗΣ: 2. --- ΣΙΤ ----- ΕΠΙΣΙΗΤΟΦΟΝΟΥ: 3. --
Σ --- Μ --- ΦΥΓΕΝΗΣΜΗΤΡΟΦΟΝ ΥΜΑΝΙΗΣ.

My first attempt to restore this verse was; Σειστός, ὅτ' ἔκφυγεν ἥς μητρο-
φόνου μανίης, in accordance with Ovid's line concerning Oréstes:† "Exactus
furiis venerat ipse suis." I esteem that, however, which I have given above,
as on every account preferable, as well from the traces still extant on the
marble, as from the more graphical delineation it presents of the degree of
mental torture under which the fugitive laboured. Compare the following:
Aischýl.:‡ 'Ελελεῦ, ἐλελεῦ, ὑπό μ' αὐτὸ σφάκελος Καὶ φρενοπληγεῖς μανίαι θάλπουσ',
Οἴστρον δ' ἄρδεις χρίει μ' ἄπυρος. Sophokl.:§ Οἶμοι μάλ' αὖθις οδὸν εἰσέδν μ' ἄμα
Κέντρων τε τῶνδ' οἴσθημα, καὶ μνήμη κακῶν. Euripíd.:|| ἴδρυσαι βρέτας, Ἐπώνυ-
μον τῆς ταυρικῆς, πόνων τε σῶν, Οὐς ἐξεμόχθεις περιπολῶν καθ' ἑλλάδα Οἴστοις
ἐρινύων. Also with the expression μητροφόνου μανίης, the verse in Euripídes in
allusion to the same Oréstes:** Εἶπερ γε κηλὶς ἔβαλέ νιν μητροκτόνος.

11. Ἐνδείην δ' οἱ ἄμυνε. My copies of this hemistich were: 1. --- ΔΕΙ
----- ΙΑΤΗΣΟΦΟΥΙΗ - ΠΡΟΣ: 2. --- ΔΕΙ ----- ΙΑΙΗΙΣΟΦΟΥΙΗ
ΤΗΡΟΣ: 3. ----- Ε ----- ΤΑΠΗΡ κ. τ. λ. The exceeding indistinct-
ness of all the elements in the first hemistich deprive any attempt at restoration,
which can be made, of all claim to acceptance on the ground of certainty.
The same may be observed of the letters ΔΕΙ, though appearing in two of my
copies: this may have been ΑΣΙ, and therefore one of my first restorations
was Ἰασιν δ' οἱ ἔνεγκε. I then tried, Ἦκεσε δ' ἐνδείην, but this advanced ΔΕΙ
farther into the verse than appeared to be sanctioned by the monument. I ac-
cordingly substituted for it Ἐνδείην δ' οἱ ἄμυνε.

The supplement Ἰασιν is, considered in itself, unexceptionable, as the fol-
lowing from Sophoklēs†† proves: Πόθεν δ' ἂν εὖροις τῶν ἐμῶν σὺ πημάτων Ἀρηξιν,

* l. 66. init. Εἶσαν occurs in Iliád. β'. 549. Καὶ δ' ἐν Ἀθήνῃσ' εἶσαν, ἐφ' ἐνὶ πτόνι νηφ.

† Trist. iv. 4. 70.

‡ Prometh. 877. ss.

§ Oidíp. R. 1317. s.

|| Iphig. in Taur. 1453. ss. Comp. Jacobs, Anthol. Palat. ix. 354., xl. 387.

** Iphig. in Taur. 1200.

†† Eléktra, 875. s.

οἷς ἴασιν οὐκ ἔνεστ' ἰδεῖν; it comes recommended also by the view which the author of these lines evidently appears to have taken of the symptoms of the hero's malady, namely, that it was a derangement of the nervous system resulting from his consciousness of guilt, and therefore to be treated with medicaments suited to the case. On the other hand, ἐνδείην seems more in harmony with ἀλγῆος in the ninth verse, and may be susceptible, moreover, of a meaning peculiarly applicable to the condition of Oréstes, whom Ovid* had before designated "egentem mentis." I need scarcely add, that the restoration which I have adopted is strictly Homeric: for example; † εἴποτε δ' αὖτε Χρειαὶ ἐμείο γένηται ἀεικέα λογιὸν ἀμῶναι τοῖς ἄλλοις.

Ibid. Σοφοῦ. Thus in the Epigr.: ‡ Ἦλθε δὲ καλλίγνωτος ὁ κῶϊος, ὁ πλατυλέσχος, τῆς παιωνίδος πληθόμενος σοφίης.

12. Γλαυκίῳ, βουλαῖς. My first copy was, ΙΑΜΥΡΕ° - - - - ΝΕ: 2. ΙΑΥΚΕ - - - - ΙΣ: 3. ΓΛΑΥΚΙ° - - - - ΙΣ. The second hemistich was sufficiently plain. The restoration βουλαῖς appears to me to be certain.

The connexion which is here intimated as having subsisted between the family of this Glaukías, and Ártemis, leaves no doubt upon my mind of his being the same individual whose daughter is mentioned in the second verse as having been constituted her priestess by the goddess herself.

Ibid. Σκυθίης. This Ethnic is important, as it implies, so far as it goes, the writer's adoption of the dramatic narrative of Eurípides: for Σκυθίης here means Ταυρικῆς, as Ártemis is styled by Pausanías: § Καί τοι διαμεμένηκεν ἔτι καὶ νῦν τηλικούτο ὄνομα τῇ Ταυρικῇ θεῷ. He had before mentioned, Τούτοις δὲ Ἡρόδοτος ὁμολογοῦντα ἔγραψεν, Ταύρους τοὺς ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ θύειν Παρθένῳ (i. e. to Ártemis) τοὺς ναυαγούς. Agreeably to this we read in Ovid: || "Quæque colunt Scythicæ regnum nemorale Dianæ;" and in Lucan, ** "Et Taranis Scythicæ non mitior ara Dianæ."

13. Κᾶτα ῥόον πλῶς κ. τ. ἐξ. This verse has occasioned me more trouble than any in the entire composition, in consequence of the injuries which the first hemistich had sustained. The following were the results of my successive tran-

* Trist. II. 395.

† Iliád. α'. 340. s.

‡ Viz. by Agathías. Vide Antholog. II. 22. 19. 5. s. Ed. Ald. 1550. Brunck. III. 58.

§ III. 16. 6., I. 43. 1.

|| Metamorph. XIV. 331.

** I. 441.

scriptions: 1. ΔΗΑΙΥΤΑΔΗΑΙΧΕΙΜΕΡΟΝΙΔΗ: 2. - ΑΙΤΑΙΟΥΤΛ - Σ - - - ΣΑΡ - ΟΥΔΥΣΧΕΙΜΕΡΟΝΙΔΑ: 3. - ΛΗΑΙΟΥΠΛΟΣ - - - Ρ - ΟΥΔΥΣΧΕΙΜΕΡΟΝΙ ΔΗΑ. The final result has, as usual, been expressed in the engraved form.

Κᾶτα is the well-known Krâsis for καὶ εἴτα, and corresponds accurately to its present position: but I own that I could have wished the sanction of the marble to καπί, that is, καὶ ἐπί, for thus we should have had the Homeric ἐπιπλῶς expressed in Tmêsis, presenting the construction ἐπιπλῶς οἶδμα, agreeably to the line,* "Ἦγαγε Σιδονίηθεν ἐπιπλῶς εὐρέα πόντον. But this, as is evident from the copies, I could not introduce, and so have been constrained to adopt the simple participle. As it is, we recognise in πλῶς οἶδμα the construction in the verse,† "Ὡ ξεῖνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρά κέλευθα.

Οἶδμα is the undoubted restoration in the second hemistich. Thus in the Homeric Hymn:‡ "Ἡ εἰς οἶδμ' ἄλιον πολὺχθον αὖτις ὀρούσει. Euripid.:§ Τύριον οἶδμα λιποῦσ' ἔβαν. Again:|| αἵματος δ' ἀπορροαὶ 'Ες οἶδμ' ἐσηκόντιζον οὐρία ξένω. So also δυσχείμερον: Hom.** Οἱ περὶ Δωδώνην δυσχείμερον οἰκί' ἔθεντο. Eurip.:†† Οὐτ' ἐν πνοαῖσι χείματος δυσχείμερον.

14. *Οργια κ. τ. ἐξ. 1. - ΡΤΕΑ - - - - - ΣΘΕΜΙΣΗΓΔΑΙΣΕΝ. 2. - ΡΠΑΘΑΛ - - - - - ΣΘΕΜΙΣΗΓΛΑΙΣΕΝ. A third transcript gave me ΟΡΓΙΑΘΑΛ, and then ΩΣ before ΘΕΜΙΣ.

The word *Οργια merits a particular notice. SERVIVS‡‡ has defined it thus: "Orgia apud Græcos omnia sunt sacra, ut apud Latinos Cærimoniæ." Passow§§ more explicitly: "geheime, religiose Gebräuche; geheimer Gottesdienst, zu dem nur der besonders Eingeweihte Zutritt hatte, ganz gleichbedeutend mit μυστήρια."

The étymon generally proposed is *ὄργή, "frenzied excitement," which answers well to the circumstances of the Dionysiac worship: but the application of the term to these was a more recent extension of its meaning. SERVIVS adds ὄρος. GESNER||| suggests ἀπὸ τοῦ εἵργειν, which its affinity to μυστήρια renders highly probable: but he should have added a citation from the Scholiast on

* Iliad. ζ'. 291.

§ Phœniss. 202.

†† Kresphónt. Fr. xiii. 4.

§§ Griech. Wörterb. B. ii. p. 361. b.

|| Vid. not. in Lucian. Philópatr. x. vol. ix. p. 515. Bipont.

† Odys. γ'. 71.

|| Hélène, 1587. s.

‡ In Apoll. i. 417.

** Iliad. β'. 750.

‡‡ Not. in Æneid. iv. 302.

Apollónios : * Ὀργια, τὰ μυστήρια· παρὰ τὸ εἶργειν τοὺς ἀμνήτους αὐτῶν, adding another, ἢ τὰ ἐν ὀργάσι γινόμενα, viz., in the sacred grounds of Deméter and Persephónē, between Athênai and Mégara.† But why not deduce it from ἔρδω, a verb of sacred import, with a preterite ἔοργα? The accurate Passow, indeed, seems to incline to this; for he proposes ἔργον in the course of his exégesis of this term.

The following citations may serve to illustrate it in its several applications. Heródotos uses it to express the Mysteries of the Achaian Deméter : ‡ καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀχαιῶς Δήμητρος ἱρόν τε καὶ ὄργια. In the Hymn to Deméter§ it denotes the Eleusinian rites : Ὀργια δ' αὐτὴ ἐγὼν ὑποθήσομαι, ὡς ἂν ἔπειτα Εὐαγέως ἔρδοντες ἐμὸν νόον ἱλάσκοισθε. Again : || Δρησμοσύνην θ' ἱερῶν, καὶ ἐπέφραδεν ὄργια πᾶσιν Σεμνὰ, τὰ τ' οὐπὼς ἔστι παρεξέμεν, οὔτε πυθέσθαι, οὔτ' ἀχέειν. The Mysteries of the Kábeiroi, deities worshipped by the Pelasgoí of Lêmnos and Samothráke, are so designated by Heródotos : ** Ὅστις δὲ τὰ Καβείρων ὄργια μεμύηται, τὰ Σαμοθρήϊκες ἐπιτελεύουσι παραλαβόντες παρὰ Πελασγῶν, οὗτος ὡνήρ οἶδε τὸ λέγω. The rites of the worship of Kybéle also, by Euripídes : †† Τὰ τε ματρός μεγάλας ὄργια Κυβέλας θεμιτεύων.

We now proceed to consider it as designative of the rites of the Dionysiac cult. Bp. MALTBY ‡‡ has cited, in illustration of this, a fragment of the Edonoí of Aischýlos ; but seems to have been misled by BOTHE's restoration of the second line. The sentence in Strabo§§ wherein it occurs establishes beyond doubt the reading, ὄργανα, not ὄργια. The latter, however, occurs in the following lines of the same poet : ||| Φιλοθύτων δέ τοι πόλεος ὀργίων Μνήστορες ἔστε μοι, which most certainly refer to the Dionysiac worship, an institution of Kádmos himself.*** The same specific attribution occurs in the introductory lines of the

* In Argonaut. A'. 920.

† Ruhnken. in Tim. p. 195. Passow in voc. ὀργάς, B. II. p. 361. a.

‡ v. 61. extr.

§ v. 274.

|| v. 476.

** II. 51. m.

†† Bákchai, 78. a.

‡‡ Lexic. p. 624. a.

§§ x. 3. Τῆς μὲν οὖν Κότυος τῆς ἐν τοῖς Ἡδωνοῖς Αἰσχόλοισι μέμνηται, καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν ὀργάνων. Hence Dindorf, in Fragm. p. 6. a. Σεμνὰ Κότυς ἐν τοῖς ἡδωνοῖς Ὀρεῖ ὄργαν' ἔχοντες κ. τ. ἐξ., a manifest improvement on Σεμναῖς κοίταισιν ἐν ἡδωναῖς Ὀργιά τιν' ἀνόργι' ἄγοντες, as given by Dr. MALTBY.

||| Sept. c. Theb. 180. Dind.

*** Vide Schütz in loc. and Blomf. Glossar. v. 164.

Bákchai,* the speaker being the god himself: *Τοιγάρ νιν αὐτὰς ἐκ δόμων οἴστρησ' ἐγὼ Μανίαις ὄρος δ' οἰκοῦσι, παράσκοποι φρενῶν· Σκευήν τ' ἔχειν ἠνάγκασ' ὀργίων ἐμῶν.* So also in Theókritos,† describing the fate of Pentheús: *Αὐτονόα πρᾶτα νιν ἀνέκραγε δεινὸν ἰδοῖσα, Σὺν δ' ἐτάραξε ποσὶν μανιώδεος ὄργια βάκχῳ, Ἐξαπίνης ἐπιοῖσα.* Finally, Herodianós expresses the advice given by Mæssa to Elagabalus, in the following words:‡ *Εἰποῦσα αὐτῷ κεχαρισμένα, ὥς ἄρα χρὴ ἐκείνῳ μὲν τῇ ἱερwsύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ σχολάζειν τοῦ θεοῦ, βακχεῖαις καὶ ὀργίοις τοῖς τε θεοῖς ἔργοις ἀνακείμενον.*

This term finds occasionally an extension of its meaning, and, apart from any ritual which presupposes initiation on the part of those concerned in it. Thus Sophoklēs:§ *Ὅπως δὲ σεμνῶν ὀργίων ἐδαίετο Φλόξ αἱματηρά,* speaking of sacrificial rites in honour of Zeus. Elsewhere|| his Augur styles the mangled remains of the birds of prey which had perished by each other's violence, not by the ordinary ceremonial of sacrifice, *φθίνοντ' ἀσήμεων ὀργίων μαντεύματα.*

Again; magical incantations amongst the ancients were always accompanied by certain secret rites, which were supposed to enhance their effect. It is with reference to these that Lucian thus expresses himself in one of his Dialogues:** *Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐγίνωσκες τὴν ἐπώδῃν καὶ τὰ ὄργια,* Kritias meaning thereby, that Triephôn was not duly qualified to perform the feat which he professed himself able to accomplish.

Ibid. *Θαλλοφορῶν.* I regard this restoration as certain, and read it *περισπωμένως*, Oréstes being represented as approaching the Erinýes in quality of a Supplicant, in token of which it was requisite that he should bear the *γλαυκᾶς θαλλὸν ἱρὸν ἐλαίας*,†† which was the emblem of the peace and reconciliation for which he sued. Thus the Aíthra of Eurípides:‡‡ *Ἐς τᾶσδε γὰρ βλέψας' ἐπηυξάμην τάδε Γραῦς, αἱ λιποῦσαι δώματ' ἀργέας χθονὸς Ἰκτῆρι θαλλῷ προσπίτνουσ' ἐμὸν γόνυ, Πάθος παθοῦσαι δεινόν.* On another occasion his suppliants§§ are sup-

* VV. 32. ss.

† Eidýll. xxvi. 12. ss.

‡ v. 7. init. Hence the use of the term in Latin: ex. c. Ovid. *Metam.* iv. 1. s. "At non Alcithoe Minyeias orgia censet Accipienda dei." Virg. *Æneid.* iv. 301. ss. "qualis commotis excita sacris Thyias, ubi audito stimulant trieterica Baccho Orgia."

§ Trachiníai, 765. s.

|| Antigóne, 1013.

** Philópatria, x.

†† Iphigén. in Taur. 1101.

‡‡ Supplic. 8. ss.

§§ Herakleidai, 517. s.

posed to be addressed; *Τί δ'εὖρ' ἀφίκεσθ' ἱκεσίοισι σὺν κλάδοις Αὐτοὶ φιλοψυχούν-
τες.* This Sophoklēs expresses, *Ἰκτηρίους κλάδοισιν ἐξεστεμμένοι.** We read
indeed a description of Oréstes himself as a *θαλλοφόρος* by the Pythiās in
Aischýlos;† *ἐλαίας ὑψιγέννητον κλάδον, Λήναι μεγίστῳ σωφρόνως ἐστεμμένος,*
Ἀργῆτι μαλλῶ.

The Latin poets contain many allusions to this rite. Thus Virgil:‡ “Op-
time Grajugenum, cui me fortuna precari Et vitta comptos voluit prætere
ramos.” It explains also the epithet of Statius§ in the line, “Vittatæ laurus,
et supplicis arbor olivæ.”

Ibid. *Ὦς θέμις, ἡγλαΐσεν.* That is, *ὡς θέμις ἦν ἀγλαΐσαι*, or *ἐκτελέσαι*, as in
Hesíodos,|| *Ἐκτελέσαι μέγα ἔργον, ὃ οἱ διόθεν θέμις ἦεν.* The expression *ὡς θέμις*
corresponds to the *ἦ θέμις* of the same poet in the following passage:** *οὐδ' ἄ-
θανάτους θεραπεύειν ἠθέλον, οὐδ' ἔρδειν μακάρων ἱεροῖς ἐπὶ βωμοῖς, ἠὲ θέμις ἀνθρώ-
ποισι κατ' ἤθεα, viz., καθὰ θέμις καὶ δίκαιόν ἐστι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.*†† Also, to Homer's
ἦ θέμις ἐστί, “prout fas,” or “consuetudo, est.”‡‡

The verb *ἡγλαΐσεν* answers to the Latin “ornavit:” ex. gr. “ornare con-

* Oidíp. R. 3.

† Eumenídes, 43. ss. On the use of these *θαλλοί* in precatory ceremonies, see Potter, *Archæo-
log. Græc. Lib. II. c. 5. pp. 280. ss.* Edit. Dunbar.

We find them used also during the celebration of the Panathénaias of the Athenians, of which a
detailed account is given in the same work, c. 20. pp. 479. ss. The *θαλλοφόροι* in these were per-
sons of both sexes advanced in life, the *Γραῦς* mentioned by Dikaiárchos, and the *Γέροντες*, styled
Καλοί, by Xenophôn in his *Sympos. IV. 17.* To these Aristophânes alludes in his *Vespæ*, 540. ss.
*Οὐκέτι πρεσβυτῶν ὄχλος Χρήσιμος ἔστ' οὐδ' ἀκαρῇ Σκωπτόμενοι δ' ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς, Θαλλοφόροι καλού-
μεθ', δντωμοσιῶν κελύφη.*

See the Scholiast on this passage, who cites the authority of Dikaiárchos above-mentioned, *ἐν
τῷ Παναθηναϊκῷ*, as also of Xenophôn, and Philochóros (in his *Ἀπορίαι*, as conjectured by Christianus
in his note in l.)

‡ *Æneid. VIII. 127. s.* The remarkable coin of the Gens *Æmilia*, which represents on the
obverse *Arétas*, the King of Arabia Petraia, in the attitude of a suppliant, and extending the
olive-branch, from which depend the vittæ, offers an excellent numismatic illustration of this
passage of Virgil. Vid. Eckhel, *Doctr. N. V. T. v. pp. 131. s.*

§ Thebaïd, XII. 492.

|| *Scut. Herc. 22.*

** *Opp. et DD. 134. ss.*

†† Vide Tzétz. in *Poet. Min. Græc. T. III. p. 107.* Edit. Gaisford.

‡‡ Ex. gr. *Iliás, β'. 73. Πρῶτα δ' ἐγὼν ἔπεσιν πειρήσομαι, ἦ θέμις ἐστί. ι'. 32. s. Ἀτρεΐδῃ, σοὶ
πρῶτα μαχέσομαι ἀφραδέοντι, ἠὲ θέμις ἐστίν, ἄναξ, ἀγορῇ.*

vivium," "to lay out a banquet with splendour."* Such also is its meaning in Theókr.† Ταὶ δὲ μελάμφυλλοι δάφναι τὴν, πύθειε παῖάν· Δελφὶς ἐπεὶ πέτρα τοῦτό τοι ἀγλαΐσε, "Since the Delphian rock hath given to this" (τὸ κείμενον) "its ornament" (i. e. its luxuriance) "for thee." In the passive: Píndar.‡ Ἀγλαΐζεται δὲ καὶ Μουσικᾶς ἐν ᾧ τῳ, "He" (Hieron) "is graced also with musical accomplishments." Agreeably to this we find ἀγλαΐη with the meaning attached to it, Beauty, Comeliness: as in Hom.§ Ἀγλαΐην γὰρ ἔμονγε θεοὶ, τοὶ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν, ὦλεσαν. The words are those of Penélope.

Hence came the very usual signification of the middle verb, "to rejoice," "feel pleasure," "experience satisfaction," in any possession considered as ornamental. Thus Hom.: || ἀλλὰ σέ φημι διαμπερὲς ἀγλαΐεσθαι, "but I promise to you alone the pleasure of being their owner from henceforth."

My concluding remark is on the composite form ἀπηγλαΐσεν, which I have found occurring in a fragment of an elegiac distich at the end of a Parian inscription published by Böckh from Spohn and others, with the usual exégesis.** It records a decree of the Parian community in honour of a female named Aurelia Leita, the wife of a certain Marcus Aurelius Faustus; and the lines in metre appear thus:

* * * * * ΔΙΑΤΗΝΑΡΙCΤΟΤΟΚΕΙΑΝΑΚΟΙΤΙΝ
* * * * * ΟCΑΠΗΓΛΑΙCΕΝ

As the learned editor above-mentioned has offered no restoration of this, I feel myself at liberty to propose one. I premise a few remarks: the first relating to the evident omission by the copyists of the syllable after ΤΗΝ in the first line. This, I conclude, happened in consequence of its resembling ΤΗΝ in the forms of its characters, the casualty having often happened, under such

* Vid. Cicer. vL Verr. c. 20.

† Epigr. i. 3. s.

‡ Olymp. i. 22. s.

§ Odyss. σ'. 179. s.

|| Iliás, κ'. 331. Add to these examples the passage in Simonídes, Περὶ γυναικῶν, σcxxx. 67. ss. Gaisf. Καλὸν μὲν ὦν θέημα τοιαύτη γυνή· Ἀλλοιοι· τῷ δ' ἔχοντι γίγνεται κακόν· Ἦν μὴ τις ἢ τύραννος, ἢ σκηπτούχος ᾗ, Ὅστις τοιούτοις θυμὸν ἀγλαΐζεται.

** Corp. Inscriptt. T. II. p. 346. n. 2384. 9.

circumstances, to myself: I therefore propose ΠΑΝ.* I consider, moreover, ΦΑΥCΤΟC to be a very probable restoration in the commencement of the second line, as ΑΚΟΙΤΙΝ precedes in the first; that is, that the husband had added these lines himself, through a desire of contributing to the honour decreed to the wife. We may, therefore, suppose that the distich originally appeared in some such form as this:

Τοῦτο γέρας, διὰ τὴν παναριστοτόκειαν ἄκοιτιν,
Μνησθεὶς τῆς ἀρετῆς Φαῦστος ἀπηγγάϊσεν.

This honorary memorial, for the sake of his wife, the mother of an all-pre-eminent offspring, Faustus, remembering her worth, hath decorated.

It appears sufficiently plain from the foregoing details that the composition now before us might have claimed, had it escaped the injuries of time and barbarism, no inferior position amongst the contributions to the Greek Anthologia, which have at different times engaged the attention of scholars of the highest eminence. As it is, most unfortunately, the marks which the finger of time has impressed on the monument have been so deeply graven, that for any epigraphist to profess to restore it letter by letter to its original state, could scarcely be deemed other than a presumptuous self-confidence. To compensate this, however, we possess throughout indications more or less clear of all such components as it would be next to impossible to reproduce had they been utterly effaced; and these are found to supply most valuable hints in relation not merely to the author's scope, but suggestive also of the identical expressions which he had selected. To turn these to their proper account, it is true, presupposes in the decipherer a certain degree of sagacity disciplined in the school of experience, the rarity of which endowment must constitute my plea, should my deductions fail of commanding the assent of my readers.

* The compound πανάριστος occurs in Hesiod. Opp. et DD. 291. Οὔτοι μὲν πανάριστοι, ὅς αὐτοὺς πάντα νοήσει. In defence of the triple compound which I have introduced here, I may appeal to Homer, Iliás, σ'. 54. *Ω μοι ἐγὼ δειλὴ, ὦ μοι δυσαριστοτόκεια.

POSTSCRIPT.

Page 198, note (††).—The epigram here referred to, and which, doubtless, supplied Passow with this exégesis, must have been that by Philíppos, published in the Aldine “Anthologia,”* and more recently in the Análekta of BRUNCK.† In the former it concludes thus: Σοὶ γὰρ ὑπὲρ βωμῶν ἀτμὸν λιβάνοιο φίλκππος ῥέξει καλλιθύτων, ταῦρον ὀρειονόμον, agreeably to which the Lexikón by Konstantinos notices the epithet alone, without seeming to recognise the existence of the verb. This is proved by the following extract:‡ “Καλλιθύτων βωμῶν in Epigra. altarium in quibus immolatur seu litatur pulchris et splendidis victimis.” The inadvertence which I have corrected in this note consisted in the incautious substitution of “Eurip.” in the place of “Epigr.”

It will be seen from the citation, given in the context, of the concluding line of this epigram, which has been taken from the Análekta, that two important alterations have been made in it by BRUNCK; the first consisting in a change of the accentuation of καλλιθύτων, which he reads περισπωμένως, thus converting it into a participle; and the second, in replacing the Aldine reading, ταῦρον, with κάπρον. I conclude that the former of these alterations had been suggested by the asyndetous construction which necessarily resulted from making both ἀτμὸν and κάπρον predicate cases of the same verb ῥέξει, a syntactical inconvenience, however, if it can justly be styled so, which appears to me scarcely to warrant the rejection of the older accentuation, more particularly now that we possess in our Patmian epigram indubitable proof of the use of καλλίθυτος.

The extract which I have given in this note from Passow contains no reference to authority farther than what may be surmised from his mention of βωμός, and this suggests a belief that he had in view the above-mentioned epigram by Philíppos. If such be the fact, and the authority cited by him under the head καλλιθυτέω, viz., “Phil. Th. ep. 47. 6.,” be this identical epigram, we

* Vide VI. 10. 1. Ed. Venet. 1550.

† Vol. II. p. 224.

‡ Vol. II. p. 18. b. Ed. 1592.

have a new canon, under the head of "contradictory propositions," added to Logic.

Bishop MALTBY has been more circumspect, as no mention whatever of our epithet occurs in his excellent edition of MORELL's *Lexikón*. Καλλιθυτέω alone is recognised.

Page 199, note ()*.—This custom of sacrificing goats in honour of Ἄρtemis is particularly mentioned in an epigram by Theodorides: * Καί σοι ἐπὶ ῥέξει γόργος χιμάριοι νομαίης Αἶμα, καὶ ὠραίους ἄρνas ἐπὶ προθύροις, viz., Ἀρτέμιδος. In the case before us, the account which the accomplished traveller CLARKE has given of the Fauna of Pátmos† sufficiently explains the use of the former of these animals in the sacred rites of its tutelary.

Page 204, note (§).—I have already observed, that it would be hazardous to trace the origin of the myth embodied in the seventh and eighth lines to the geological knowledge current in the Græco-Roman period; ‡ and consequently that we are to resort for a solution of its existence to some such etymological perversion as we know with certainty to have obtained in the instance of Rhódos. In the cases both of this island and Pátmos, we have found reason to believe, that the true étyma of their names were Aramæan terms expressive of local characteristics; § but that the Greek lost sight of this during his Hellenizing process, claimed the results of that process as indigenous appellations, and then constructed myths in unison with his imaginary themes.

Thus also he elaborated the name of the central island of his Kykládes, and then tasked his ingenuity to account for its origin. This led to his invention of a species of legend, viz., of Poseidôn having intervened with his might to confer upon it, before a wandering and instable tract, a fixed and "conspicuous" position. || Another version of this myth assigns the agency to Apóllon.**

It is certain, however, that the Aramaic dialect, one which we cannot but suppose to have been either identical with, or closely allied to, the language of

* Anthol. Ald. iv. p. 201. n.3. 3. s. In Brunck, ii. 42.

† Travels, etc. vol. iii. p. 371. 4to. edit.

§ Supr. p. 204.

** Vide Æneid. iii. 75. ss., and Serv. in loco.

‡ Vide supra. pp. 191. 203.

|| Supr. p. 205.

the early navigators of the Mediterranean, furnishes a singularly descriptive word when understood with reference to their circumstances, the Hellenization of which also conducts at once to $\Delta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. I mean לִיָּדָה , fem. לִיָּדָה , signifying "fearful," "formidable," whence לִיָּדָה , of which לִיָּדָה is a synonym, "terror," or "affright;"* all which were excellently adapted to express the feelings of the explorer of the Ægæan, more especially whilst steering his course through the group of islands of which Dêlos is the centre, the theme of the poet's salutary warning : †

"Interfusa nitentes

Vites æquora cycladas."

Accordingly, the perils of the mariner through those cliff-bound guardians of their domain would at once suggest so appropriate a designation of the point from which they diverged.

These remarks are intended as supplementary to a preceding paragraph in this section, where I waived the discussion by reason of its interference with my more immediate subject. ‡ I have now only to add, that the learned BOCHART has long since proposed the same étymon, but on a different ground, namely, that of Dêlos having been the chosen seat of the Apollinean cult. § This may be probable, on supposition of that worship having been introduced by the Phœnician navigators themselves, whose Heraklê's I conceive to have been the prototype of the Greek Apóllon, with the title and attributes of the בַּעַל שֶׁמֶשׁ : but of this we possess no such evidence as we have of their importing the worship of Poseidôn into Rhódos. ||

To return to Pátmos. I have stated, at perhaps greater length than the occasion might seem to warrant, my views as to the origin of the persuasion to which we owe the seventh and eighth verses of our epigram. It may happen, however, after all, that scientific readers may attribute to them a profounder meaning, than the classical student would be disposed to allow them, under the influence of impressions similar to those of CLARKE, whose introductory notices relating to the geology of this island are singularly germane to our pre-

* Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. et Syr. pp. 112. 116.

† Horat. Carm. i. 14. 19. s.

‡ Supr. p. 205.

§ Cit. in Stephan. ubi supra, p. 395. b.

|| Vide supra, p. 205. note (*).

sent subject: "Soon after coming to anchor, the author landed, with a view of examining the cliffs; as the ports of the island have the appearance of craters, and substances resembling lava are common among the fragments of its rocks. The monastery of St. John is situated upon the highest verge of a crater of this description; and the harbour of La Scala owes its origin to another. Perhaps there is not a spot in the Archipelago with more of the semblance of a volcanic origin than Patmos. The cliffs exhibit no form of regular strata, but one immense bed of a porous black rock, in which are numerous nuclei of a white colour, as large as a pullet's egg, in the form of crosses. all of them intersecting crystals of *feld-spar*, imbedded in decomposing *trap*."*

The question then resolves itself into this: Are we to suppose that the science of the second century of our era had been such as to qualify an observer, however intelligent, to speculate on the events of a strictly geological epoch, as suggested by such phænomena? A more protracted discussion of this subject may be avoided by the following references, which will acquaint the reader with the views of the ancients on its scientific aspect. Herakleides, in Excerpt. de Polit. p. 455., already cited, *supra*, p. 205, n. (*), states the fact simply with respect to Rhodos. Plinius, however, in Nat. Hist. II. 88. s., and Marcellinus, in Reb. Gest. XVII. 7. sub. fin., more ambitiously, but with a copious infusion of mythical references in their respective catalogues, a critical investigation of which would extend this essay very far beyond its prescribed limits.

The fine passage in Pindar. Olymp. VII. 100-28. Φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαὶ Πήγαι, κ. τ. ἐξ, is, of course, merely the statement of a poet, but merits a notice here, as, in all probability, the ground-work of our author's lines respecting the origin of his Pátmos.

SECTION IV. b.

The Titulus next in order, and which, with the foregoing, comprises my whole collection of memorials of ancient Pátmos, was copied from a marble in the Convent that stands in the centre of the town. It has sustained more

* Travels, ubi *supra*, pp. 369. s.

damage than even its predecessor; of twenty three lines, which alone it was possible to trace, the fifth having altogether disappeared from the monument, and one-half at least of the remainder retaining but a few letters or isolated words to render the decipherer any assistance. Fortunately, however, sufficient has on the whole been left to acquaint us with the specific object held in view, accompanied also with the name of the individual, of certain honours awarded to whom the document was a record. It is referrible, moreover, to a class of inscriptions, the language of which was, in a principal degree, framed after a technical model; so that, provided the peculiarities of any particular member thereof were tolerably preserved, a competent acquaintance with the municipal phraseology suited to its case enables the decipherer to supply, with a reasonable chance of accuracy, whatever deficiencies the marble may present in its technical details. By pursuing this method, and availing myself of a large collection of tituli, both edited and in manuscript, from the islands of the Ægæan, I am of opinion, that it is in my power to submit a very probable restoration of the whole, with the exception, in certain instances, of Names and Numerals, which no ingenuity could hope to divine.

The collection of tituli to which I have alluded as already published is that of the learned Böckh: those which I have mentioned as inedited comprise a large number in my own possession, the fruits of personal research, which it is my anxious desire at some future period to submit to the members of the Academy.

The general tenor of the epigraph before us is to evince the gratitude of the inhabitants of Pátmos, and the other islands of the Ikarian sea, towards an individual named Chrysókomos, in return for his various acts of kindness and liberality towards their community. This was evinced by their decreeing him a crown of gold and a portrait (*εἰκόνα γραπτήν*) of himself, exclusively of other honours, commensurate to his alacrity in their service.

This being premised, I proceed to submit, in the first place, my transcript of what remained on the monument, then a translation of it in accordance with the form to which I have ventured to restore it, and lastly, that form itself in the minuscule character, accompanied by the proofs of my several restorations.

 ΟΚΟΜΟΣ . ΑΙΤΟΛ ----- ΕΔΟΞΕΤΩΙΚΟΙ
 ΤΩΝ ΑΔΑΙΚ ΜΕΝ ΗΣ . Ω
 ΤΩΝ -----
 5 ΤΟΥ . Ι . Π ΙΟ -----

 Ο ΚΑΘΙΔΙΑΝΕΚΑΣΤΩΙ ΕΑΥΤΟΝΕΥ ΗΝ
 ΠΑΡΕΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ . . . ΑΠΟΤΗΣ ΓΗΣΑ
 ΧΜΑΣ ----- ΕΛΛΗΝΑΣΑΡΧ
 10 ΟΝ ----- ΤΑΥΤΑ
 Δ Ο . Α . . ΕΚ Ω ΓΑΣΤΑΙ
 ΧΡΥΣΟΚΟΜΟΣ -----
 ΣΥΜ Μ . . ΕΙ
 ΝΕΙΤΑΙΝΥΝ . . . ΠΗΓΓΕΛΤΑΙΕΡΜΗΝΤ . . Ν ΠΑΤΜΙ
 15 ΑΝΑΘΗΣΕΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΡΑΧΜΑΣ ΔΙΑΚΟΣΙΑΣ ΔΩ
 ΩΣ ΕΚ ΔΑΝΕΙΣΟΝΤΑ . . . ΕΠΗΓΓΕΛΤ
 ΕΚΤΩΝΙΔΙΩΝΤΑΣ ΤΕ ΘΥΣΙΑΣ
 ΙΑΣΜΑΤΑ ΥΠΟΔΕΧΕΣΘΑΙ ΔΕ ΔΟΧΘΑΙ
 ΜΕΝ ΝΕ ΕΧΕΙ . Δ ΕΠΟΥ
 20 ΑΣΚΑΙ ΑΡΜ . . ΟΜΕΝ . ΣΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΣ ΑΙΔ
 ΙΣΤΕΦ . Ν . . ΑΠΟΧΡΥ
 Ν . . ΚΑ ΟΝΙ ΓΡΑΠΤΗΙΑΤΕ
 ΥΜΟΝΗΜ Ν . . Ε ΕΡΓΩΙ
 ΗΓΗΜΑ ΑΝΑΓ -

- “ During the Monarchship of ***** in the month ***** ,
 Pursuant to the motion of Chrysókomos and Tolmides ; it hath seemed good
 To the general council of the islanders of the Ikarian Hellás met in assembly :
 Whereas we have been cognizant of Chrysókomos, son of ***** tos
 5 Approving himself undeviatingly, and on all occasions, benevolently disposed
 Both towards the states of the islanders in general, and towards their citizens
 Individually, as manifested by his acts of beneficence to each :
 As also, of his having provided out of his private resources
 ***** drachmaí on the occasion of his officiating as
 10 Voluntary epimenian legate to the Héllenes, our rulers :

- Being, we repeat, aware of these services, as well as of the amount
 Out of his private funds contributed by Chrysókomos, son of * * * * * tos;
 As also of his promising additional services on our behalf
 For the time to come; and that now he hath, of his own free-will,
 15 Engaged to present an offering of a statue of Hermés to the Patmian community,
 As well as to advance on loan free of legal interest two hundred drachmaí;
 And hath, moreover, voluntarily undertaken to charge himself
 With the expenses of the sacrificial solemnities, and the victims:
 Be it decreed, to confer upon Chrysókomos the meed of our praise,
 20 And to accord to him becoming and appropriate honours;
 As also to present him, in the temple of Hermés, with a crown
 Of the value of ten golden statères, together with a portrait of himself,
 In testimony of his having been a person distinguished by
 His assiduity and zeal on our behalf, both in act and in counsel.
 25 The Quæstors of the Treasury are desired to have this Psephism engraven
 On a tablet of stone, and set up alongside the altar of Hermés.
 The Quæstors of the Treasury are also directed to defray the expenses of the tablet."

Ἐπὶ Μονάρχου (τοῦ δαίνοιο)· μηνὸς (τοῦ δαίνοιο)· Χρυ-
 σόκομος καὶ Τολμίδης εἶπαν. Ἔδοξε τῷ Κοινῷ
 τῶν καθ' Ἑλλάδα Ἰκαρίην συμπορευομένων νησιωτῶν·

1. Ἐπὶ κ. τ. ἐξ. It is quite evident from the second line, which commences with the fragment of a Proper name, that one, at least, had preceded it in the perfect inscription: but not the slightest trace of it remained on the marble. I have been, therefore, obliged to have recourse to another titulus, the import of which is analogous to this one of Pátmos, with a view to its partial restoration.

I refer here to a Koian inscription, hitherto, as I believe, inedited, which has long lain amongst my papers; a Psephism of a Κοινόν very similar to, if not identical with, the Assembly mentioned in our epigraph. It commences thus: ΕΠΙ . ΜΟΝΑΡΧΟΥ . ΝΙΚΟΦΡΟΝΟΣ . ΜΗΝΟΣ . ΑΡΤΕΜΙΤΙΟΥ . ΕΔΟΞΕ . ΤΩΙ . ΚΟΙΝΩΙ . ΤΩΝ . ΣΥΜΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΩΝ . ΠΑΡΑΚ[ΤΙΩΝ]. I accordingly supplied the deficient line with reference to this heading, which also gave me συμπορευομένων in the third, whereof the only traces existing on the Patmian marble were the letters ΜΕΝ.

I wish it to be understood, however, that in adopting *Ἐπὶ Μονάρχου* as a heading to the titulus before us, I intend merely to express the fact, that all such documents commenced with a mention of their respective Eponymes. That the Patmian magistrate who bore that title was styled a *Μόνάρχος*, I am not in a condition to prove, unless on the assumption that the *Κοινὸν παρακτίων* of the Koïan titulus was the same body with the *Κ. τῶν καθ' Ἑλλάδα Ἰκαρίαν* of that before us: but this it would be rash to assert; firstly, because it is generally agreed, that *Kô*s did not lie within the limits of the Ikarian sea; and secondly, because of the essential difference of the two denominations; *παράκτιοι* expressing a position along the coast, namely, of that part of Asia Minor contiguous to which the islands of the *Κοινόν* lay. These *Κοινά*, in effect, seem to have been councils of Representatives, chiefly, if not wholly, convened for religious purposes: and it appears, therefore, natural to conclude, that several had existed, each regulated by the circumstances of cult and geographical position. Thus we possess undoubted evidence of one having existed amongst the *Kyklâdes*, the place of whose meeting was *Tênos*, as we find it mentioned under the name of *τὸ Κοινὸν τῶν νησιωτῶν* in a Psephism of that place, which BÖCKH has edited from VILLOISON.* The members of this council of confederated islands, termed *Σύνεδροι*, are represented in this document as decreeing honours to a certain benefactor named *Τίμον*, amongst which we observe the following: **ΚΑΛΕΣΑΙ . ΑΥΤΟΝ . ΕΠΙ . ΤΑ . ΙΕΡΑ . ΚΑΙ . ΘΥΣΙΑΝ . ΠΑΣΑΝ . ΗΝ . ΣΥΝΤΕΛΟΥΣΙΝ . ΟΙ . ΣΥΝΕΔΡΟΙ . ΤΟΙΣ . ΘΕΟΙΣ . ΥΠΕΡ . ΤΥΧΗΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΣ . ΤΩΝ . ΝΗΣΙΩΤΩΝ.** To this body, therefore, very probably, belonged the appointment of the *Theoroi* of the islands each year, to attend the celebration of its anniversary solemnity in *Dêlos*. Hence we find, in a Psephism of the same *Tênos* published by BÖCKH from OSANN and others,† a certain *Ammónios* receiving due honour from the Tenian authorities for his having undertaken the office of *Θεαροδόκος* of the confederated states.

The same amount of evidence is now afforded us by this Patmian inscription of a *Κοινόν* having existed within the precincts of the Ikarian sea, that is, a Con-

* Corp. Inscr. T. II. p. 255. n. 2334. ll. 21. ss. Bœckh's restoration.

† Ibid. p. 250. n. 2329. ll. 8. s.

vention of representatives from the islands of the Ionian confederacy within its limits, to attend to its religious concerns. As I have intimated already, I regard this council as wholly distinct from the one with which the Koïan titulus acquaints us as including representatives from those islands alone of the Doric Sporádes which were *παράκτιαι*, or contiguous to the Asiatic coast. What the particular cult was to the care of which the attention of the members of the Koïan *κοινόν* was addressed, appears sufficiently obvious: we may reasonably presume it to have been that of Zeús, from the repeated occurrence of the name of that deity in the epigraph:* and in the same way we may infer from the fourteenth line of the Patmian, in which we recognise ΕΡΜΗΝ, that the Hermaian solemnities particularly engaged the consideration of the Ikarian *Κοινόν*.

According to this view of the subject, connected with the impossibility of determining under present circumstances the precise title of the Patmian Eponyme, we can only supply ΕΠΙ . ΜΟΝΑΡΧΟΥ, "dicis causa," or, as we now stand on Ionian ground, replace it with one of the eponymes of Ionía; for example, the Ephesian ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ, or the Teïan ΙΕΡΕΩΣ.

The restorations in the second line are certain, with the exception of ΤΟΛΜΙΔΗΣ, of which only the first syllable remained. ΕΙΠΑΝ, the Roman "dixerunt," or "retulerunt," was the expression used in almost every instance, with reference to the originators of any motion in these *Κοινά*. Thus we find in the Koïan titulus, ΧΑΡΜΙΠΠΟΣ . ΠΑΡΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΦΙΛΟΣΤΟΣ . ΦΙΛΟΣΤΟΥ . ΕΙΠΑΝ. This clause, it is true, comes after the words ΕΔΟΞΕ . ΤΩΙ . ΚΟΙΝΩΙ, etc., in that titulus; and it might, therefore, be expected, that I should be guided by its analogy whilst supplying the lacunæ in the fourth and fifth lines of the Patmian. But the clear traces which the marble presented of the names Chrysókomos and Tolmídes before ΕΔΟΞΕΝ were obstacles to my adopting this order which I could not surmount. As they could not have been Eponymes . . . otherwise we should have had ΧΡΥΣΟΚΟΜΟΥ, and this exclusively of the difficulty of accounting for a double Eponyme . . . we can regard them in no other light than as the proposers of the Psephism. Indepen-

* Viz., in the eleventh, twelfth, and twenty-ninth lines. See the close of this section, where this inscription has been given in full, with the requisite elucidations.

dently of these considerations, we possess evidence, in documents of this kind, of the order *εἶπαν* – *ἔδοξε* – *δεδοχθαι* being frequently observed; as in the Karthaian inscriptions edited by Böckh,* *Ἡρακλείδης εἶπεν· ἔδοξε τῇ Βουλῇ καὶ τῷ Δήμῳ κ. τ. λ.* Again: *Ἐσχατίων εἶπε· ἔδοξε*, etc. *Σωσίδικος Ἰσονίκου εἶπεν· ἔδοξε*, etc. It appears, moreover, from the first two of these, that it was not contrary to usage to dispense with adding the paternal names of the movers, as we see has been done on the present occasion.

The third line occasioned me considerable perplexity in the commencement, but only there, as I feel reasonably certain of the supplements I have introduced towards the close. The corresponding passage of the Koian titulus appears thus: **ΤΩΝ . ΣΥΜΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΩΝ . ΠΑΡΑΚ - - - - - ΤΩΝ**. This gave me the important supplement **ΣΥΜΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΩΝ**, of which the only trace on the marble was the penultimate syllable. **ΝΗΣΙΩΤΩΝ** also may be reckoned as certain; but I found it impracticable to deal so with **ΠΑΡΑΚΤΙΩΝ**, which, consequently, I rejected as foreign to our inscription, substituting another form of restoration, which appears in singular accordance with the few letters that could at all be discerned.

The sole difficulty here is the denomination *Ἑλλὰς Ἰκαρία*, as applied to the islands represented in the *Κοινόν*: but this may very easily be removed by considering with what tenaciousness the ancient Greeks held to their common ethnic, *Héllenes*. Agreeably to this, we find it in the ninth line attributed by the framer of the Psephism to the citizens of the state which was dominant, at the epoch when it passed the *Κοινόν*, in this quarter of the *Ægæan*. In this view, to designate it as *Ἑλλὰς Ἰκαρία* was but to proclaim their consanguinity with their rulers. We may here, however, read *Ἰκαρίων*, without any material alteration in the sense.

Ἐπειδὴ ἐγνώρισamen Χρυσόκομον τοῦ * * * * *

5 του διὰ παντὸς εὖνουν ὄντα διατελοῦντα,
καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν ταῖς τῶν νησιωτῶν πόλεσι, τοῖς τε
πολίταις καθ' ἰδίαν, ἐκάστῳ ἑαυτὸν εὐεργέτην
παρεχόμενον, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας χορηγήσαντα δρα-
χμὰς * * * * * γενόμενον πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἀρχ-

* Corp. Inscr. T. II. pp. 282. 284. nn. 2352. 2353. 2356.

- 10 οντας ἡμῖν αὐτεπάγγελον ἐπιμήνιον· ταῦτα μὲν
εἰδότες, ὅσα δὲ ἐκ τῶν ιδίων αὐτοῦ ἐξείργασται
Χρυσόκομος τοῦ * * * * * του, καὶ ὅτι πλείονα
συμφέροντα ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον ὑπ-
ισχνεῖται· νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελλται Ἑρμῆν τῇ νήσῳ Πατμῇ
- 15 ἀναθήσειν, καὶ δραχμὰς διακοσίας δώσειν,
ὥς ἐκδανείζοντα· καὶ ἐπήγγελλται παρὰ ταῦτα
ἐκ τῶν ιδίων τὰς τε θυσίας καὶ τὰ θυσ-
ιάσματα ὑποδέχεσθαι·

It will be seen from the uncial titulus, that in the fourth, fifth, and sixth lines, the characters had been almost wholly effaced from the monument. The supplements, therefore, which I have adopted, have been selected in conformity to analogous inscriptions. The syllable **ΤΟΥ**, which commences the fifth line, was undoubtedly the final one of the paternal name in the second case, which name, therefore, we must suppose to have ended in **ΤΟΣ**, as **ΑΔΕΙΜΑΝΤΟΣ**, **ΦΙΛΟΣΤΟΣ**, or the like. Lastly, from **ΠΑΡΕΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ**, with which the eighth line begins, we infer that the verb *ἐγνωρίσαμεν*, or one of similar import, came after *ἐπειδή*. These observations being premised, I offer the following citations, which will acquaint the reader with the phraseology usually employed in such cases as the present.

I take my first example from a Teïan inscription which Böckh has edited from MAITTAIRE, CLARKE, and others: * **ΕΠΕΙΔΗ . ΚΡΑΤΩΝ . ΞΩΤΙΧΟΥ . ΚΑΛΧΗΔΟΝΙΟΣ . ΑΥΛΗΤΗΣ . ΕΥΝΟΥΣ . ΩΝ . ΔΙΑΤΕΛΕΙ . ΤΩΙ . ΚΟΙΝΩΙ . ΤΩΝ . ΣΥΝΑΓΩΝΙΣΤΩΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΛΕΓΩΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΠΡΑΤΤΩΝ . ΑΙΕΙ . ΤΑ . ΣΥΜΦΕΡΟΝΤΑ . ΤΟΙΣ . ΣΥΝΑΓΩΝΙΣΤΑΙΣ** κ. τ. ἐξ. My second† relates to the same individual: **ΕΠΕΙΔΗ . Ο . ΙΕΡΕΥΣ . ΤΗΣ . ΣΥΝΟΔΟΥ . ΚΡΑΤΩΝ . ΞΩΤΙΧΟΥ . ΕΝ . ΤΕ . ΤΩΙ . ΪΗΝ . ΠΟΛΛΑΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΜΕΓΑΛΑΣ . ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΕΙΣ . ΕΠΟΙΕΙΤΟ . ΤΗΣ . ΠΡΟΣ . ΤΟΥΣ . ΑΤΤΑΛΙΣΤΑΣ . ΕΥΝΟΙΑΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΚΑΤ' . ΙΔΙΑΝ . ΥΠΕΡ . ΕΚΑΣΤΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΚΑΤΑ . ΚΟΙΝΟΝ . ΤΩΝ . ΥΦ' . ΕΑΥΤΟΥ . ΣΥΝΗΓΜΕΝΩΝ** κ. τ. ἐξ.

7. *Καθ' ιδίαν*. Elsewhere, as in the Teïan inscription last cited, *κατ' ιδίαν*.

* Corp. Inscr. T. II. p. 661. n. 3068. 1. ss.

† Ibid. p. 666. n. 3069. 2. ss.

The aspiration of *idios* arose very probably from its having had the Digamma prefixed in the Æolic dialect.*

8. *Παρεχόμενον*. That is, *διατελούντα* (l. 5.) *παρεχόμενον*. Thus in a Delian inscription edited by Böckh from ΜΑΙΤΤΑΙΡΕ : † **ΚΑΙ . ΧΡΕΙΑΣ . ΔΙΑΤΕΛΕΙ . ΠΑΡΕΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ . ΔΗΛΙΩΝ . ΤΟΙΣ . ΕΝΤΥΓΧΑΝΟΥΣΙΝ . ΑΥΤΩΙ . ΚΑΙ . ΚΟΙΝΗΙ . ΚΑΙ . ΙΔΙΑΙ**.

Ibid. *Χορηγήσαντα*. My first restoration here was **ΔΑΠΑΝΗΣΑΝΤΑ**, but I altered it to its present form, as agreeing better with the traces on the marble. It is also abundantly authorized : as by the Teïan inscription which Böckh has edited from CHANDLER : ‡ **ΟΥΔΕΜΙΑΝ . ΑΝΕΝΕΓΚΑΝΤΕΣ . ΤΩΙ . ΚΟΙΝΩΙ . ΔΑΠΑΝΗΝ . ΑΛΛ' . ΕΚ . ΤΩΝ . ΙΔΙΩΝ . ΓΑΝΤΑ . ΧΟΡΗΓΗΣΑΝΤΕΣ . ΑΦΕΙΔΩΣ . ΕΣ . ΤΑΣ . ΘΥΣΙΑΣ . ΓΑΣΑΣ . ΤΑΣ . ΣΥΝΤΕΛΟΥΜΕΝΑΣ . ΥΠΟ . ΤΗΣ . ΕΧΙΝΟΥ . ΣΥΜΜΟΡΙΑΣ . ΤΟΙΣ . ΤΕ . ΘΕΟΙΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΤΟΙΣ . ΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΑΙΣ**. Thus Demosthènes : § *Οὐ μόνον αὐτοὶ προθύμως συμπολεμήσουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ βασιλέα τῶν Περσῶν χρήματα χορηγεῖν ἡμῖν προτρέψονται*. Also Polybios : || *τὸ δὲ Κελτῶν πλῆθος τὸ τὰ πεδία κατοικοῦν, συνεστηκὸς ταῖς τῶν Καρχηδονίων ἐλπίσι, δαψιλῶς μὲν ἐχορήγει τὸ στρατόπεδον τοῖς ἐπιτηδείοις, wherein we perceive the construction altered.*

9. *Ἕλληνας*. Who these Hellenes were there is some difficulty in determining in the present condition of the epigraph. It is probable, however, that the Athenians are meant, whose generals had terminated the war that had raged between the Samians and Milesians about some lands near Priène, and subjected Sámos to the Athenian rule. This happened at the close of the eighty-fourth Olympiad, at which period it was likely that Pátmos and the other islands of the Ikarian sea shared the fate of the Samians.**

It appears from the uncial copy of this inscription, that of the ninth and tenth lines only twenty-one letters were discernible on the marble, that is, less than one-third of the total number which we may reasonably conclude to have

* Compare Böckh, C. I. T. II. p. 277. n. 2347. c. l. 8. and his note on n. 2329. l. 7.

† *Ibid.* p. 223. n. 2267. ll. 7. ss.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 654. n. 3066. ll. 10. ss.

§ *Contr. Epist. Philipp.* p. 153. ll. 26. ss.

|| *Hist. III.* 68. 8.

** Vide Böckh's Commentary on the Samian titulus, containing the answer of Lysímachos, King of Thráke, to the Samians, on the subject of certain disputed lands near Priène, *Corp. Inscr.* T. II. p. 214. n. 2254.

been inscribed on the monument in its original state. I cannot, therefore, be expected to vouch for the entire accuracy of my supplements: but that they claim attention is manifest from the corresponding clause in the Koïan epigraph, to which I have already referred as one of my guides in this discussion. It is quite clear, that the expenditure of his private funds by Chrysókomos, which entitled him to so much gratitude, must have been directed to some important object connected with the business of the Κοινόν, the superintendence and due regulation of certain religious solemnities, probably the Hermaïc. Consequently, I can conceive no supplements more proper to be introduced here than such as relate to the conveying authentic information (ἐπαγγελία) of the acts of the Κοινόν to the ruling powers, whose sanction may be presumed to have been necessary in order to their being carried into execution.

When this commission was undertaken voluntarily, the individual intrusted with it appears to have been styled αὐτεπάγγελος, and in this case he must be presumed to have charged himself with the outlay attendant on the performance of its duties, otherwise there would have been little or no merit in its acceptance. By supposing, then, Chrysókomos to have acted so, an hypothesis with which the supplement χορηγήσαντα is in exact accordance, we invest him with an important claim to the gratitude of the Patmian community, and similar in its degree to that of a Thyateirene patriot, whom a section of his fellow-citizens honoured with a statue as, amongst other services, πρεσβεύσαντα πρὸς τὸν Αὐτοκράτορα προῖκα, καὶ κατορθώσαντα τὰ μέγιστα τῇ πατρίδι.*

The following is the clause in the Koïan epigraph to which I have referred as sanctioning the preceding supplements: ΕΠΕΙΔΗ . ΝΙΚΑΓΟΡΑΣ . ΘΕΥΔΩΡΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΛΥΚΑΙΘΟΣ . ΛΕΥΚΙΠΠΟΥ . ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΙ . ΕΠΙΜΗΝΙΟΙ . ΑΥΤΕΠΑΓΓΕΛΟΙ . ΤΑ . ΤΕ . ΙΕΡΑ . ΕΞΕΘΥΣΑΝΤΟ . - II . ΚΑΙ . ΑΝΕΝΕΩΣΑΝΤΟ . ΤΑΝ . ΟΥΣΙΑΝ . ΤΟΥ . ΔΙΟΣ. κ. τ. ἐξ. These expressions place in a very clear light what was the special business of the Κοινά and their ἐπάγγελοι, namely, sacred concerns; particularly when compared with the fourteenth and following lines of the titulus now before us; νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελλται, κ. τ. λ.

11. Ἐξείργασται. There can be little doubt of the correctness of this res-

* Vid. Böckh's Corp. Inscr. T. II. p. 852. n. 3495. 9. s., and FABRETTI's titulus cited supra, pp. 188. s. Böckh has edited this from SPON and WHEELER in C. I. T. I. p. 448.

toration. 'Εξεργάζεσθαι means "to accomplish;" as in Lucian :* Εἰ δὲ καὶ Φειδίας ἢ Πολύκλετος γένοιτο, καὶ θαυμαστὰ πολλὰ ἐξεργάσαιτο. Again :† 'Ορᾶς, ὅπως ῥαδίως ἅμα καὶ ποιητικῶς ἐξεργασάμεθα. Diodor. : Καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν κεραυνοσκοπίαν μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐξεργάσαντο. The simple perfect occurs, in the active sense in which it is here used in the compound form, in a passage from S. Kýrillos, cited by Hemsterhuis,‡ where Sokrátes is said εἰργάσθαι σὺν τῷ πατρὶ τὴν λιθοτομίαν. Compare Thukydídes :§ Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὑμεῖς, μελετῶντες αὐτὸ εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν, ἐξείργασθέ πω, that is, τὸ τῆς θαλάσσης. Instances, however, are not wanting of its passive sense; for example, Heródot. :|| Τὸ μὲν δὴ ἔργον ἐξείργασται μοι, κ. τ. λ.

The supplements in the two following verses have been suggested by the verb which closes the period, ὑπισχνέται, whereof traces so clear remained as at once to suggest its restoration. Συμφέροντα is a word of most frequent occurrence in Psephisms; as in the first of the inscriptions from Téos cited above,** πρᾶττων αἰεὶ τὰ συμφέροντα τοῖς συναγωνισταῖς

14. 'Επήγγελλται. This perfect, like ἐξείργασται in the eleventh line, admits of both an active and passive construction. It is active here, as in two of the sacred Epistles : "Ὅτι ὁ ἐπήγγελλται δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι,†† and, Νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελλται, λέγων. "Ετι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σεῖω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν.‡‡ In the following it is passive : "Ἀχρὶς οὐ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελλται.§§ It implies the binding oneself by a voluntary engagement: whence ἐπαγγελία, "freewilliges Versprechen," in Passow. Thus Demosth. :||| Τοῦ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐμπλέοντος ἐναντιωθέντος, καὶ τοῖς ναύταις μισθοὺς, εἰ διασώσαιεν τὴν ναῦν, μεγάλους ἐπηγγελέμενον.

The reading **ΕΡΜΗΝ** in this line was very distinct on the marble, and agrees precisely with **ΑΝΑΘΗΣΕΙΝ** in the following, which is the verb most usually employed in the cases of such offerings, as has been stated in a former section of this memoir, wherein I have also explained the meaning of 'Ερμῆν (and the like) in its present connexion.*** ΠΑΤΜΙΗΙ was also clearly defined, but not

* In Somn. 9. fin.

† In Contempl. 4. fin.

‡ Commentar. in Somn. 12. l. 5.

§ I. 142.

|| III. 65. m.

** P. 225.

†† Romans, c. iv. v. 21.

‡‡ Hebrews, c. xii. v. 26.

§§ Galatians, c. iii. v. 19.

||| Orat. adv. Zenóthemín, p. 884. ll. 10. ss.

*** Supr. pp. 110. 116. 166.

so the intermediate letters which appear in my copy, **T - NEΞE -**. I regard it, however, as certain, that the psephism exhibited **THINHΞΩI**, the fifth and sixth letters of which are constantly mistaken in worn monuments, even by experienced transcribers, for **E** and **Ξ** respectively. The reverse also holds good; and the same may be said of **B, E, I, K, Σ**. An **Ω** bisected vertically often assumes the appearance of **Ϛ, E**, etc., as the perplexed traveller often finds when the merely mechanical part of his task is completed.

16. 'Ως ἐκδανείζοντα, that is, "with the understanding that the money was not to bear interest." That such was properly the meaning of δανείζω, ἐκδανείζω, Saumaise* has abundantly proved, and after him Suicer and Schleusner. When the compact between parties was to the contrary effect, it was usual to add ἐπὶ τόκῳ. Hence the gloss of Hesýchios: Δανείζει· μεταδίδοι, τοῖς ἐνδέεσι κίχρῃ. The words of Theophýlaktos† are very precise: Δάνεισμα δὲ οὐ τὸ σὺν τόκῳ λέγει, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀπλῶς χρῆσιν· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ χωρὶς τόκου ἐδάνειζον· the command being, Ἐὰν δὲ ἀργύριον ἐκδανείσῃς, τῷ ἀδελφῷ τῷ πενιχρῷ παρὰ σοὶ --- οὐκ ἐπιθήσεις αὐτῷ τόκον.‡ Thus S. Luke: § Οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανείζουσιν ἵνα ἀπολάβωσι τὰ ἴσα, that is, ἀτόκως, the precise sum lent, and no more. In just the same way a "loan" amongst us bears no interest, unless it be so understood on delivering it, and the usual legal formalities be observed.

It thus appears that the merit of Chrysókomos consisted in his placing a certain sum at the disposal of the Κοινόν free of interest. This we may parallel with the liberality of Tímon the Syrakusian, towards the islanders of the Kycládes, which is made the subject of commendation in the Tenian psephism already referred to,|| namely, his facilitating on their behalf the exchange of Attic money into Rhodian, and thus protecting them against the rapacity of the extortioners of those days. The titulus proceeds as follows in Böckh's minuscule: ** Τῶν πωλούντων ὑπὲρ ἑκατὸν δραχμῶν τοῦ Ῥοδίου ἀργυρίου οὐκ ἔλαττον ἀπαιτούντων ἑκατὸν καὶ πέντε δραχμῶν - - - - - βουλόμενος ἐν πάσιν εὐχαριστεῖν, οὐκ ἐπράξατο οὐδένα κόλλυβον τῷ ἀργυρίῳ τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ προσεδέξατο αὐτὸ ἀκόλλυ-

* In libr. de Usuris, referred to by Suicer in his Thesaur. Ecclesiast. T. I. p. 822., and by Schleusner in Lexic. Nov. Test. on the verb δανείζω. Compare the Critica Sacra, pp. 68. s.

† Comment. on S. Matth. c. v. v. 42.

‡ Exod. c. xxii. v. 25.

§ C. vi. v. 34.

|| Vid. supr. p. 222.

** V. 4. ss.

βιστον, καὶ περιποίησε τοῖς νησιώταις· in our language, making them a present of five per centum by exchanging at par.

17. *Θυσίας καὶ θυσιάσματα*. The first of these words expresses the solemnities which accompanied the sacrifices . . . the *Feriae* . . . and the second, the victims which were offered. Thus Lucian : * Πάντα ταῦτα ἔργα φασὶν εἶναι τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος μεμψιμοιρούσης ὅτι μὴ παρελήφθη πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Οἰνέως, that is, as appears from what follows, τὰ ἱέρεια, τὴν ἐορτήν. That *θυσίασμα* means the offering itself, or the matter of the sacrifice, is plain from its being the version adopted by the LXX. for $\Pi\Omega$ and $\Pi\psi$ in the Pentateuch : † Οὐ σφάζεις ἐπὶ ζύμῃ αἷμα θυσιασμάτων μου. *Θυσίασμα τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐστί.*

Δεδόχθαι Χρυσόκο-
μον μὲν ἐπαινέσαι, παρέχειν δὲ αὐτῷ τιμὰς πρεπού-
20 σας καὶ ἀρμοζομένας· στεφανῶσαι δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν
τῷ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ ἱερῷ στεφάνῳ ἀπὸ χρυ-
σῶν δέκα, καὶ εἰκόνι γραπτῇ, ἅτε ἄνδρα σπουδαῖον καὶ
πρόθυμον ἡμῖν γενόμενον ἐν τε ἔργῳ καὶ
ῥήματι. Οἱ Ταμίαι ἀναγραφάντων τόδε τὸ
25 ψήφισμα εἰς τὴν στήλην λιθίνην, καὶ ἀναθέντων
παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ· τὸ δὲ ἀνά-
λωμα εἰς τὴν στήλην τελεσάντων οἱ Ταμίαι.

18. *Δεδόχθαι*, κ. τ. ἐξ. Thus the Koian titulus : ΔΕΔΟΧΘΑΙ . ΝΙΚΑΓΟΡΑΜ . ΜΕΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΛΥΚΑΙΘΟΝ . ΕΓΓΙΝΕΣΑΙ . κ. τ. ἐξ. ΚΑΙ . ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΣΑΙ . ΑΥΤΟΣ . ΑΠΟ . ΧΡΥΣΩΝ . ΔΕΚΑ. Here we perceive the ellipsis of ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩ, as in a fragment of Lycûrgos given by Phôtios : ‡ Λυκοῦργός φησιν· Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ Καλλισθένην ἑκατὸν μναῖς ἐστεφανώσατε, meaning thereby, στεφάνῳ ἀπὸ ἑκατὸν μνῶν.

I have introduced a supplement into the commencement of the twenty-first

* De Sacrific. 1.

† Comp. Exod. xxiv. 25., xxix. 18. Cod. Alexandrin. lxx.

‡ Bibl. c. 396. s. BECKER has given this fragment from Harpokratión, under the Oration Περὶ Διοικήσεως, n. 1H.

line, for which I have no authority excepting the mention of Hermês in the fourteenth, as an object of religious veneration to Chrysókomos and the Patmians. It was, moreover, usual to perform the ceremony of crowning distinguished persons in a temple or a theatre, and during the celebration of some public anniversary solemnity. Thus in a Tenian inscription of DODWELL and others, which Böckh has edited,* we read : ΔΕΔΟΧΘΑΙ . ΤΗΙ . ΒΟΥΛΗΙ . ΚΑΙ . ΤΩΙ . ΔΗΜΩΙ . ΕΠΑΙΝΕΣΑΙ . ΤΕ . ΑΥΤΟΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΣΑΙ . ΘΑΛΛΟΥ . ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΙ . ΕΝ . ΤΩΙ . ΙΕΡΩΙ . ΤΩΙ . ΤΟΥ . ΓΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΟΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΤΗΣ . ΑΜΦΙΤΡΙΤΗΣ . A Teïan psephism, edited by the same from CHANDLER, proceeds as follows: † ΔΕΔΟΧΘΑΙ . ΤΗΙ . ΕΧΙΝΟΥ . ΣΥΜΜΟΡΙΑΙ . ΕΠΑΙΝΕΣΑΙ . ΕΛΛΑΝΙΚΟΝ . ΖΩΙΛΟΥ . κ . τ . λ . ΚΑΙ . ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΣΑΙ . ΕΚΑΣΤΟΝ . ΑΥΤΩΝ . ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΙ . ΘΑΛΛΟΥ . ΑΡΕΤΗΣ . ΕΝΕΚΕΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΦΙΛΟΔΟΞΙΑΣ . ΗΣ . ΕΧΟΝΤΕΣ . ΔΙΑΤΕΛΟΥΣΙΝ . ΕΙΣ . ΤΟ . ΚΟΙΝΟΝ . ΤΗΣ . ΣΥΜΜΟΡΙΑΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΑΝΑΓΓΕΙΛΑΙ . ΑΥΤΟΝ . ΤΟΝ . ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΝ . ΤΟΙΣ . ΛΕΥΚΑΘΕΟΙΣ . ΜΕΤΑ . ΤΑΣ . ΣΠΟΝΔΑΣ . ΕΝ . ΗΙ . ΑΓΓΙΝΗΤΑΙ . ΗΜΕΡΑΙ . Η . ΣΥΜΜΟΡΙΑ . Theatres were, as I have mentioned, very usual localities assigned to such purposes: accordingly we find, in three inscriptions of Tênos, which appear in Böckh's collection from MÜLLER, DUBOIS, OSANN, ROSE, etc., ‡ the proclamation of crowns decreed to certain individuals by the municipal authorities made by the Árchon Stephanephóros, ΕΝ . ΤΩΙ . ΘΕΑΤΡΩΙ . ΠΟΣΙΔΕΙΩΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΩΝ . ΤΩΙ . ΑΓΩΝΙ . ΤΩΝ . ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΩΝ . So also in a passage of Demosthénes§ we read : 'Ὡς ἄρα δεῖ στεφανῶσαι Δημοσθένην Δημοσθένους Παιανία χρυσῶ

* Corp. Inscr. T. II. p. 250. n. 2329. ll. 10. ss.

† Ibid. p. 654. n. 3066. ll. 18. ss.

‡ Ibid. p. 252. n. 2330., p. 254. n. 2333., p. 255. n. 2334.

§ Orat. de Corona, p. 243. 14. ss. Reisk. We find here simply χρυσῶ στεφάνῳ, which were accompanied sometimes with the mention of the precise amount, as, ἀπὸ ταλάντων ἐξήκοντα, in the crown decreed to the Senate and People of the Athenians by certain towns of the Chersónesos, in the same Oration, p. 256. 23. ss. So also in the Rhodian titulus (Böckh, II. p. 392. n. 2525. 76. ss.); στεφανωθεὶς ἐπ' ἀρετῇ χρυσέῳ στεφάνῳ ἀπὸ χρυσῶν δέκα, κ. τ. λ. Agreeably to this, we might propose, in addition to the modes of restoration of lines 20–21. about to be mentioned, the following: στεφανῶσαι δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς Ἑρμαίοις χρυσέῳ στεφάνῳ, etc.

The expression ἀπὸ χρυσῶν is elliptical, στατήρων being understood. The money value of the crown ἀπὸ χρ. δ. was therefore 200 drachmaí, if the Attic statér be meant; if that of Kýzikos, 280. Comp. Eckhel, Doctr. N. V. T. I. Proleg. Gen. pp. xli. ss. Böckh. Staatsh. d. Ath. I. p. 22.

στεφάνῳ, καὶ ἀναγορεύσαι ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, Διονυσίοις τοῖς μεγάλοις, τραγῳδοῖς καινοῖς, κ. τ. ἐξ. This, we know, was made use of by Aischínes as one of his articles of impeachment on that memorable occasion.

I have stated that such was the usual formality observed in giving effect to psephisms of this class: but instances of omission frequently occur, if not of the actual performance of the ceremony and its notification in public, at least of their being provided for in the body of the Psephism. The Koïan titulus, to which I have so frequently referred, affords an example of this, its words being simply, **ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΣΑΙ . ΑΥΤΟΣ . ΑΠΟ . ΧΡΥΣΩΝ . ΔΕΚΑ**. Perhaps the publicity implied in the twenty-fourth and following lines was reckoned by the members of the *Κοινόν* sufficient for all purposes.

There can be little doubt, however, of this formality having been duly observed in the instance of Chrysókomos; for the lacuna between **ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΣΑΙ** in the twentieth line and **ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΙ** in the following had unquestionably been occupied by a mention of the occasion on which the honour was to be conferred. Of this only one letter has remained, conveying no manner of intimation as to the proper supplement to be introduced. I am, therefore, compelled to resort to conjecture, and to propose either **ΕΝ . ΘΗ . ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΥ . ΕΟΡΤΗΙ .**, on the ground of the coins of Pátmos indicating some addiction on the part of its inhabitants to the Dionysiac cult, or the supplement which I have ventured in the minuscule, in consequence of **ΕΡΜΗΝ** appearing in the fourteenth line;* for which reason I have also introduced into the penultimate line **ΠΑΡΑ . ΤΟΝ . ΒΩΜΟΝ . ΤΟΥ . ΕΡΜΟΥ**. It appears to me, that the chances of correct restitution are considerably enhanced by adhering to this last, as Hermès might seem to have been the especial object of religious veneration to the *Κοινόν*, otherwise why assign his regard of that deity as one of the chief merits of Chrysókomos?

24. *Οἱ Ταμίαι*, κ. τ. ἐξ. The marble retained of the entire clause from this to the end of the titulus but four letters, which appear in my copy under the form **ΑΝΔΕ**~, a manifest distortion of the first five letters of **ΑΝΑΓΡΑΨΑΝΤΩΝ**. I have, therefore, given a conjectural restoration of it, selecting my Koïan inscription as its basis, but replacing **ΤΟΥ . ΔΙΟΣ** in its

* Vid. preceding note.

twenty-ninth line, for the reason which I have just now stated, with **ΤΟΥ . ΕΡΜΟΥ**. There can be little doubt of the period, in the form now proposed, exhibiting substantially the same type of expression which originally appeared on the monument, as is sufficiently proved by a comparison of its analogues. Thus in a Keian titulus (of Karthaia) which Böckh has edited after Brøndsted,* and retaining, of its final clause, only the fragment **ΑΠΟΛΛΩ ΝΟΣΓΟΛΕΑΝ**, he has restored in minuscule as follows: *Ἀναγράφαι δὲ τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα πρὸς τῷ νεῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ γινόμενον δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν*. The Tenian psephism† of the Κοινόν of the Kykládes is much more verbose, directing its being engraved, set up (or as we say, posted) in two different localities, a copy to be taken of each and sent to Délos, and the cost both of the Stélai and the Crown to be defrayed by the Tamías out of certain revenues. The wording of the first, second, and fourth of these is essentially the same with that of the analogous clause in the inscription of Kôs.

Having availed myself so frequently of this remarkable document, which has long slumbered in my portfolio, I feel that I could not perform a more acceptable service to my fellow-academicians in general, and more especially to those of the number whom I now behold around me, than by concluding this memoir with a recital of it in its integrity. It was copied from a marble in Antimachía . . . doubtless the identical stéle with mention of which it concludes . . . and most fortunately has passed through the ordeal of time and vandalism without sustaining any graver injury than it is possible for the scholar to redress. Its age appears to be that of the palmy days of Hellás, antecedent to the ascendancy of Makedonía, and probably coætaneous with the Pátmian psephism, to the elucidation of which it has so materially contributed.

* Corp. Inscr. T. II. p. 285. n. 2357. 10. ss.

† Supr. p. 222.

	ΕΓΙΜΟΝΑΡΧΟΥΝΙΚΟΦΡΟΝΟΣΜΗΝ	Ἐπὶ Μονάρχου Νικόφρονος· μηνὸς	
	ΑΡΤΕΜΙΤΙΟΥΕΔΟΞΕΤΩΙΚΟΙΝΩΙ	Ἄρτεμτίου· ἔδοξε τῷ Κοινῷ	
	ΤΩΝΣΥΜΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΩΝΓΑΡΑΚ	τῶν συμπορευομένων παρακτίων	
	ΗΣ...ΑΝΧΑΡΜΙΓΓΟΣΓΑΡΜΕΝΙΣ	νησιωτῶν· Χάρμικπος Παρμενίσκου	
5	ΚΑΙΦΙΛΟΣΤΟΣΦΙΛΟΣΤΟΥΚΑΙΛΥΚ	καὶ Φίλοστος Φιλόστου, καὶ Λύκαι-	5
	ΘΟΣΓΑΡΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΥΕΙΓΑΝΕΓΕΙ	θος Παρμενίσκου εἶπαν· Ἐπει-	
	ΔΗΝΙΚΑΓΟΡΑΣΘΕΥΔΩΡΟΥΚΑ	δὴ Νικαγόρας Θευδώρου, καὶ	
	ΛΥΚΑΙΘΟΣΛΕΥΚΙΓΓΟΥΓΕΝΟΜ	Λύκαιθος Λευκίππου, γενόμε-	
	ΝΟΙΕΓΙΜΗΝΙΟΙΑΥΤΕΓΑΓΓΕ	νοι ἐπιμήνιοι αὐτεπάγγε-	
10	ΛΟΙΤΑΤΕΙΕΡΑΞΕΘΥΣΑΝΤΟ	λοι, τὰ τε ἱερὰ ἐξεθύσαντο τῷ	10
	ΙΙΚΑΙΑΝΕΝΕΩΣΑΝΤΟΤΑΝΟΥ	Διὶ, καὶ ἀνεενώσαντο τὴν οὐ-	
	ΣΙΑΝΤΟΥΔΙΟΣΚΑΙΤΑΝΥΠΟΔΟΧ	σίαν τοῦ Διός, καὶ τὴν ὑποδοχὰν	
	ΕΓΟΗΣΑΝΤΟΤΩΝΔΑΜΟΤΑΝΚΑΙ	ἐποήσαντο τῶν δαμοτῶν καὶ	
	ΤΩΝΑΛΛΩΝΓΑΝΤΩΝΑΞΙΩΣΤΩΝ	τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ἀξίως τῶν	
15	ΘΕΩΝΣΠΟΥΔΑΣΚΑΙΓΡΟΘΥΜΙΑΣ	θεῶν, σπουδᾶς καὶ προθυμίας	15
	ΟΥΘΕΝΕΛΛΕΙΓΟΝΤΕΣΟΓΩΣΟΥΝΚΑ	οὐθὲν ἐλλείποντες. ὅπως οὖν καὶ	
	ΟΙΜΕΤΑΤΑΥΘΑΙΡΟΥΜΕΝΟΙΕΓΙΜΗΝΙΟΙΑ	οἱ μετὰ ταῦθ' αἰρούμενοι ἐπιμήνιοι ἄγγε-	
	Λ...ΠΡΟΘΥΜΟΤΕΡΟΣΑΥΤΟΣΓΑΡΕ	λοι προθυμότερος αὐτὸς παρέχων-	
	ΤΑΙΕΙΔΟΤΕΣΤΑΝΤΩΝΔΑΜΟΤΑΝ	ται, εἰδότες τὴν τῶν δαμοτῶν εὖ-	
20	ΝΟΙΑΝΔΕΔΟΧΘΑΙΝΙΚΑΓΟΡΑΜΜΕ	νοιαν· Δεδόχθαι Νικαγόρα μὲν	20
	ΚΑΙΛΥΚΑΙΘΟΝΕΓΑΙΝΕΣΑΙΕΓΙΤ	καὶ Λύκαιθον ἐπαινέσαι ἐπὶ τε	
	ΤΑΙΑΙΡΕΣΕΙΚΑΙΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑΙΑ.Ε	τῇ αἵρέσει καὶ ἐνσεβείᾳ ἣς ἔ-	
	ΧΟΝΤΙΓΟΤΙΤΟΣΘΕΟΣΚΑΙΤΟΣ	χοντι ποτὶ τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τοὺς	
	ΑΜΟΤΑΣΚΑΙΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΣΑΙ	δαμότας, καὶ στεφάνῳσαι αὐ-	
25	ΤΟΣΑΓΟΧΡΥΣΩΝΔΕΚΑΤΟΙ	τοὺς ἀπὸ χρυσῶν δέκα. Τοῖ	25
	ΤΑΜΙΑΙΑΓΓΡΑΨΑΝΤΩΝΤΟΔΕ	Ταμίαι ἀγγραψάντων τότε τὸ ψή-	
	ΙΣΜΑΕΣΣΤΑΛΑΝΛΙΘΙΝΑΝ	φισμα εἰς στάλαν λιθίναν, καὶ	
	ΑΝΑΘΕΝΤΩΝΓΑΡΑΤΟΝΒΩΜΟ	ἀναθέντων παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν	
	ΤΟΥΔΙΟΣΤΟΔΕΑΝΑΛΩΜΑΓ	τοῦ Διός· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα γε-	
30	ΝΟΜΕΝΟΝΕΣΤΑΝ.ΤΑΛΑΝΤΕ	νόμενον εἰς τὴν στάλαν τελε-	30
	ΣΑΝΤΩΝΤΟΙΤΑΜΙΑΙ	σάντων τοῖς Ταμίαι.	

- “ During the Monarchship of Nikóphron : in the month Artemítios.
 It hath seemed good to the Community of the islanders, adjoining the coast,
 Assembled in council, on the motion of Chármippos, son of Parmenískos,
 5 And Philóstos, son of Philóstos, and Lýkaithos, son of Parmenískos :
 Whereas Nikagóras,* son of Theúdoros, and Lýkaithos, son of Leúkippos, have,
 Whilst discharging the duties of voluntary epimenian† legates, in addition
 10 To solemnizing the expiatory offerings in honour of Zeús,‡ repaired also
 The estate of the god, and have provided hospitable reception§ on behalf
 Of the burghers, and all other individuals, in a style|| becoming the dignity
 15 Of the gods, lacking in no respect a proper assiduity and zeal : to the end
 That such persons as may hereafter be elected to discharge the office of
 Epimenian legates may address themselves to their duties with the greater
 Alacrity, from the consciousness that by so acting they will insure
 20 The goodwill of the burghers ; Be it decreed, to accord our praises to
 Nikagóras and Lýkaithos, in return for the devotedness and piety
 With which they are actuated towards the gods and the burghers ; as also
 25 To crown them to the amount of ten golden statêres.
 The Treasury-Clerks are desired to have this present Decree engraven on
 A tablet of stone, and set up alongside the altar of Zeús. The Treasury-Clerks
 Are directed, moreover, to defray the amount expended upon the tablet.”

* The occurrence of this name here seems to decide a question with respect to a lection on one of the Imperial coins of Kôs by VAILLANT, as to which ECKHEL hesitates in Doctr. N. V. T. II. p. 601. b.

† “ Epimenian,” that is, whose duties related to the *ιερά ἐπιμήνια* of Zeús, who appears to have been the Tutelary of the Κοινόν. *Ἐπιμήνια τὰ καθ’ ἕκαστον μῆνα θνόμενα*. Harpokrat. in Orat. Lykûrg. Περὶ *ιερείας*, in Fragn. Becker. n. 1Δ. *Ἐπιμήνια ἐπιτελέουσιν*, Heródot. VIII. 41. l. 10. on which see Valckenâr’s note. Also, Brunck on Sophokl. Eléktr. 280. s. *μηλοσφαγεῖ θεοῖσιν ἔμμεν’ ἱερά τοῖς σωτηρίοις*. Vide supra, pp. 220. 227.

‡ Διῷ, “to Zeús.” A most certain restoration, and in accordance with numismatic evidence. Vide Eckhel on the coins of Kôs, ubi supra, pp. 600. s.

§ “ Hospitable reception,” *ὑποδοχάν*. Iph. in Aul. 1218. s. *ἀρ’ εἰσδέξομαι Ἑμῶν φιλαῖσιν ὑποδοχαῖς δόμων, πατέρ;* Heródot. VII. 119. *Κτήνεα εἰστέσκον ἐς ὑποδοχὰς τοῦ στρατοῦ*. Vid. Böckh. Corp. Inscr. II. n. 2525. b. 49. s.

|| “ In a style, etc.,” *ἀξίως, τ. θ.* Thus in Fascic. Inscr. II. p. 134. n. CLVL 6. *καταξίως τῷ θεῷ προέστακαν*.

SECTION V.

THE preceding sections have been composed with a reference, as much as possible exclusive, to the heading of the Memoir in its several divisions, with a single exception, if that can with propriety be termed one which resulted from the exigencies of so interesting and important a member as the metrical inscription from Pátmos. The seventh and eighth lines of this remarkable composition involved, in order to their completer elucidation, an inquiry into the probable cause of their having been inserted, and this I have endeavoured to trace by the aid of language alone, thus inverting the process of the Hellenic writers, who appear to have argued *to* it, and not *from* it, while pursuing speculations which may well be termed mythical, as having had no connexion with any historical or scientific records. Accordingly, I have expressed my conviction, that the suggestive origin of those lines was the homophony of the name Pátmos (written also Páthmos), with βαθμός:* as also, that the Delian myth was the offspring of the Hellenic metamórhosis of its Aramæan name.† To these it is now my opinion that Rhódos, concerning which a similar belief was prevalent, may be added: I therefore reserve it for a fresh consideration in the course of this section, in which I also hope to make it at least probable that the sacred island of the Ægæan, the centre of the Kykladic group, admits such a thematic basis of its name as places it in the same category. This may seem to imply an abandonment of the étyma which, in the foregoing section, I had adopted from BOCHART, and, in effect, it is so in the case of Rhódos:‡ in that of Délos, I have replaced the first-mentioned theme with one which is strictly synonymous in one of its meanings, and in another, accounts for the Hellenic myth.

From all this it will be seen, that my faith in the Aramaïc origin of the larger number of the insular names of the Ægæan is implicit, and consequently that I hold the classical to be either versions of those that preceded them, or transformations into homophones invested with the Hellenic characteristics by

* Supra, p. 204.

† Supra, p. 216. s.

‡ Supra, p. 205. note (*).

means of grammatical contrivances in which the Greek language is so rich, namely, Krâsis or Elision, Prósthesis, Epénthesis, Paragogé, or their opposites. Abundant illustrations of these will be adduced in the course of the present section, which may, perhaps, be attended with their due influence on the mind of the candid and unprejudiced scholar. Such an one . . . and there are, in the present state of glossology, many such to be found . . . will agree with me in thinking, that neither learning nor ingenuity could be engaged in any less profitable task than that of the school of VAN LENNEP; in searching, I mean, for the themes of Greek words exclusively in the Greek itself; involving as it does the supposition, that a language which, by presenting numberless affinities in its least complex forms to so many more ancient than itself, distinctly proclaims the amount of its obligation to them, could ever be brought to shake off its dependence by a change in its chronological position. In other words, to become a primeval, or parent language, like that of the dialects of the Keltic races, or the precursor of the Zend and its cognates, or the Shemitic and Khamic tongues in their aboriginal form. The absurdity of supposing this is manifest; more particularly to one who, in the progress of his studies, with every prejudice operating on behalf of the self-origination (ancient moralists would term it *αὐτάρκεια*) of the incomparable language of Hellás, has been unable to close his eyes against facts; nay, more than these, against the expedients to which the disciples of VAN LENNEP are forced to have recourse in the invention of roots. Two examples may suffice: the verb *σκήπτω* is proposed, and its “stirps,” or radical verb, is pronounced to be *σάω*, with the meaning “cavo” or “incurvo,” although *𐀓𐀚𐀗* is at hand to assert its claim.* So also *ἄρδην* (that is, *αρδ-δην*, with the first letter of the adverbial suffix elided) is traced to *ἄρω*,† meaning “in altum tollo,” with the primitive (and probably Pelasgic) *αρω* in actual existence to claim its right.‡

To these an ample catalogue of other examples might be added, were this the proper occasion on which to enlarge, in any proportion to its merits,

* Vide Scheid, in Lennep. p. 971. b. Ed. Lond. Scapul. 1820.

† Comp. Passow, H. wört. etc., p. 312. b. Scheid, ubi supra, in voc. *αἶρω*, p. 895. c.

‡ Does not this root present itself in such words as Arduus, Ardea (see Georgic. I. 364.), and perhaps Ardea, Ardor? The “Silva Arduenna” in Cæsar’s Bell. Gallic. v. 3., affords very probably an example of the same.

on a subject of so much interest to archæologists. This, however, it is not; and it has been introduced by me solely as prefatory to my subsequent details on the origins ("stirpes") of the geographical and ethnical designations of an area of our globe which we are taught by the concurrent testimonies of Language and Tradition to regard as almost the exclusive domain of the Phœnikian navigators. I trust that the remarks, within these limits, to which I now proceed, will be found to justify my asserting, that opinions like the following, carry with them, particularly in the present state of our knowledge respecting the affiliation of known dialects, little or no weight: "Minime placet derivatio nominis proprii Græcorum e fonte Arabico aut Hebræo. Est lingua Græca toto cælo ab orientalibus nostris diversa: ut mirandum sit, viros eruditissimos, hac literarum luce, talibus delectari posse."* The confusion in this sentence is remarkable. Is it not quite possible for two languages to stand apart from each other in a constructional sense, and yet to approximate very observably to a greater or less degree in an elementary?

I now return to my more immediate subject, a more ample development of the principle insisted upon in those clauses of the foregoing section, wherein the étyma assigned by BOCHART† to the names Pátmos, Dêlos, and Rhódos have been adopted; but in the case of the second of these, for a reason in which I differ from that learned etymologist. The principle to which I refer has been stated by me to be, a knowledge, that we may now regard as certain, of the Aramaïc dialect having been "either identical with, or closely allied to, the language of the early navigators of the Mediterranean." I have now to observe, that this expression, "Aramaïc," is to be understood in a general sense. Properly speaking, there were two dialects comprehended under this name; the eastern Aramæan, which, combined with the learned language of the Jews,

* Vide Scheid, ubi supra, voc. "Ομηρος, p. 950. a.

† Vide "Geographia Sacra," in which these have been considered in the following order: Rhódos, Lib. i. cap. 7. col. 369. a. Pátmos, cap. 8. col. 381. Dêlos, cap. 14. col. 406. Edit. Lugdun. Batav. 1712.

As the volumes of this author are now somewhat rare, I have adapted my future references for the most part to the pages of the *Dictionarium Historicum*, etc., edited by NICHOLAS LLOYD, Geneva, 1693, which will be found to contain within convenient limits a full account of his geographical étyma.

namely, the Hebrew of their recognised canon, constituted in the Apostolic age the popular or Palæstinian, and the western or Syriac.* It is manifest, however, that we may, in the age with which we are now conversant, legitimately take a wider range in our search for our geographical étyma; so wide indeed, as to include not only the Chaldaïc, but also that other most important member of the Shemitic family, the Arabic, as it is natural to suppose that at so early a period the bond of connexion between these several dialects was far more closely drawn than at a subsequent, when their several characteristics became so distinctly marked as to render classification of them necessary.

There can, methinks, exist no reasonable doubt of the assertion ventured in this clause of the memoir, when the success which has attended the labour undertaken long since by BOCHART, and since his time followed up by PETIT, GESSENIUS, and other philologists,† in illustration of the passages in the "Pænulus" by Plautus, which are written in the Punic and Punico-Lybic dialects,‡ is considered. It has resulted from the successive researches of those eminent linguists, that these invaluable fragments of a literature, doomed to extinction by the same destiny which had foreshadowed the Daughter's ruin by the downfall of the Mother, may now be regarded as brought within the pale of actual knowledge. How has this been effected? By slow and cautious steps; a strict adherence to the data which a carefully considered text supplies; and determining the mutual relations of the elements of that text, mainly by the evidence which the Plautine version itself affords, but always consistently with the general laws of the Aramaïc type modified by special syntactical peculiarities. The same suc-

* Vide Preface by WARR to HUG's Introduction, etc., p. lxxviii.

† The first-named of these scholars followed BOCHART in his investigation of the passage here referred to, the result of which will be found in LEMAIRE's Plautus (by NAUDET), vol. III. pp. 73. s., extracted from PETIT's "Miscellanea," II. 2. The reader will find an account of GESSENIUS's labours in a learned and elaborate Memoir on the same subject, published in the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, vol. XVIII. P. Lit. pp. 3-64., by the Reverend JAMES HAMILTON, A. M., of Trinity College, Dublin. This was in the year 1836. Subsequently, in 1847, the work of M. JUDAS, "Étude Démonstrative de la langue Phénicienne et de la langue Libyque," made its appearance, in which the ingenious author has traversed the same ground with Professor GESSENIUS, and added much valuable and highly interesting matter on the subject of the Phœnikian and Phœniko-Libyan syntactical peculiarities. This is a volume of very great merit and research.

‡ Vide Act. v. Scen. 1. 2. 3.

cess seems to have attended the same course of investigation when applied to other fragments of the dialect of Phœnikia, which have survived the destroyer, Time;* so that, by the aid of an enlightened philology, definite results have now replaced the vague intimations of the Hellenic writers, with which scholars of a former age were forced to content themselves. Such was that of Diódoros† when adverting to the Phœnikians as the chief traders and colonists of the remotest times: "Making continual voyages in a commercial spirit, they founded many settlements along the maritime territory of Libýa, and not a few in the western quarters of Europe." How gratifying is it to the reader of this passage to be now enabled to trace their course of navigation from Týros, their point of egress, to the Kassiterídes of Britain, with that eloquent commentary on the historian's words laid open before him at every step,—the geographical names which we learn from antiquity.

To place this in a clearer light, we will suppose him to be carried back in idea to the age when the merchant-princes of Phœnikia monopolized the commerce of the western world, and had, in the view of facilitating the details of their traffic, established commercial depôts throughout the Mediterranean; nay, impelled by the adventurous spirit which is the surest harbinger of successful enterprise, had navigated the Atlantic to the extreme points of the then known world,‡ regions now the pride, but then the reproach of civilization. We will imagine him at Týros, embarked in one of those "argosies" which were destined to the Kassiterídes of Britain, but with all the secrecy of mercantile jealousy;§ and now on the open sea: Kýpros, perhaps, is visited, and so also Kréte . . . but to these points of his course we shall soon advert more particularly. Sikeliá, the island of the grape (סִיכֵילָא, βότρυς,) is to come next, but

* Ex. gr. the bilingual tituli (nn. 859. 894. in the "Corpus Inscriptionum") of which Böckh has given the explanations by ÅKERBLAD and GESENIUS.

† B. H. v. 20. gr. Φοίνικες ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων συνεχῶς πλέοντες κατ' ἐμπορίαν πολλὰς μὲν κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην ἀποικίας ἐποιήσαντο, οὐκ ὀλίγας δὲ καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐν τοῖς πρὸς δύσιν κεκλιμένοις μέρεσι κ. τ. ἐξ. Compare the account which Heródotos has given of their circumnavigation of Africa in iv. 42.

‡ Compare Diódoros, ubi supra, c. 22. Strab. iii. 5. fin.

§ Strab. l. c. Πρώτερον μὲν οὖν Φοίνικες μόνοι τὴν ἐμπορίαν ἔστελλον ταύτην ἐκ τῶν Γαδειρῶν, κρύπτοντες ἅπασιν τὸν πλοῦν. The course of transit to Týros is fully stated by Diódoros, ubi supra, and in c. 28. fin. where he recurs to the subject.

perhaps in one of those storms which assail the mariner so suddenly in the *Ægean* he is forced to take shelter in the haven of Melíte (מְלִיטָה, ἡ καταφυγή τῶν ἐμπόρων*). Leaving this, we may suppose the vessel turned towards the African coast, and, having escaped the perils of the *Sýrtis*, anchored in the port of Leptis (לְבִית, לֵבַת), another "Homestead" of the Tyrian mariner.† Karthago, the renowned Neápolis (Καρχηδών, קָרְתָּא קְדִישָׁא ‡) of Týros, solicits his attention next; whence we may conceive him directing his course to the port of Syrakûsai, the city of Syrakó (ΣΥΡΑΚΟΥΣΑΙ, συσωδία), of the autumnal exhalations of which, and their pernicious consequences, the historian has left us a record.§

The coast of Hispania now opens before him, and we may suppose our voyager on his course thither, first veering to the right to touch at the Sardinian Káralis (קָרַלִּיס, קִרְיָא), and then entering the harbour of Palma, in the greater Balearis (בַּלְעָרִיס, בַּלְעַל ||). Leaving this, he visits in succession the commercial stations along the southern coast of Ibería (Ἰβηρία, γῆς πέρας), first, Hasdrubal's colony, the Neápolis of Karthago: then Málaka (Μάλακα, ἡ τῶν παρεμπορέων**); Karteia, sacred to the Mélkartos (Μέλκαρτος, מֶלֶךְ קָרְתָּא) of Týros, whose once formidable columns, the Symplegádes of the Gaditane strait, Abylé (Ἀβύλα, אֲבִילָה ††) and Kálpe,

* Diodor. v. 12. med.

† Bochart. Geogr. Sacr. pp. 526. s. Lucan. ix. 948. s. "Proxima Leptis erat, cujus statione quæta Exegere hiemem, nimbis flammisque carentem."

‡ Boch. ubi supr. Lib. I. c. 35. The name Καρχηδών arose from the Sicilian change of the Θ(Γ) into X, as Salmasius has remarked: ad Solin. p. 332. Thus for ὄρνιθος, ὄρμα, were said ὄρνιχος, ἰχμα. Vid. Matthiæ, Gr. Gr. § 29.

§ Comp. Diodor. xiii. 114. fin. xiv. 70. s. Liv. xxv. 26.

|| Strab. iii. 5. pr. Καλοῦσι δὲ Βαλεαρίδας Σφενδονῆσαι ἄριστοι λέγονται καὶ τοῦτ' ἤσκησαν, ὥς φασι διαφερόντως, ἐξότου Φοίνικες κάτεσχον τὰς νήσους. This is equivalent to saying, that the name was of Phœnikian origin.

** A name taken from what appears to have been their chief branch of commerce. Comp. Strabo, iii. 4.

†† Viz. contracted from Ἰαφὲ Ἰπυλάκη, "the summit of the extremity," or "land's end;" a designation suggestive of the geographical position of Abýla.

This étymon is very much favoured by Strabo's expressions respecting it: Ἐνιοὶ δὲ στήλας ὑπέλαβον τὴν Κάλπην καὶ τὴν Ἀβύλῃ, τὸ ἀντικείμενον ὄρος τῆς Λιβύης. iii. 5. It was therefore known as Ἀβύλῃ, or Αβυλῃ, a remarkable approximation to the Egyptian compound given

"over against it" (𐤓𐤁𐤏, * κηλη?), are left behind, and the vessel, emerging into the broad Atlantic, is steered direct for its winter-quarter, the insulated

above, when it is considered that no two letters were more frequently interchanged than the Koptic ⲕ, ϕ. See Peyron, *Lexic. Kopt.* p. 19.

BOCHART has not been very successful in his search for the Punic étymon to which Avienus refers in his "*Ora Maritima*," v. 145., "namque Abylam vocant Gens Punicorum mons quod altus Barbaro est, Id est, Latino." Why, moreover, overlook the claim of the Egyptians to being the originators of this name, when we know, at least from the testimony of Heródotos, that Africa was first circumnavigated at the instance of one of their sovereigns? Vide note (†), p. 240. *supra*, and the next one to this.

* That is, "over against," "e regione:" a designation accurately descriptive of its position with respect to the corresponding headland on the opposite coast. BOCHART has had recourse to the Arabic, relying on the description of Avienus (*Ora Marit.* 348. s.), "Calpeque rursum in Græcia species cavi Teretisque (ab?) usu nuncupatur urcei:" also on Mela, whose native place, Tingentera, lay in the vicinity (cp. *De situ orb.* II. 6. fin. *Notit. Literar.* in Edit. Bipont. pp. ix. s.). Hence the Greek *Κάλη*, Hesych. *ὕδρα*, "a waterpot," "pitcher," as the étymon of which BOCHART proposes 𐤏𐤁𐤏, a supposed Phœnikian term from the Arabic *قالب* (𐤒𐤏𐤁?), "a truncated earthenware vessel." But why not from 𐤏𐤁𐤏, a "denudation," or "peeling off," from the action on the surface of the rock which IMRIE has described in his *Memoir on Gibraltar*: vide *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, vol. iv.: or from 𐤏𐤁𐤏, "sculptum," "cavatum;" Mela's words being, "Is mirum in modum concavus, ab ea parte qua spectat occasum, medium fere latus aperit?" IMRIE has also noticed the hollows in the surface, which he attributes to the action of water in the geological period when it was a sea-bed.

To none of these Shemitic themes, however, would I be disposed to assign the origin of the name *Kálpe*. I think it may, with much greater probability, be traced to the external features of the mountain, which have rendered it so valuable an acquisition to the British empire. It presents to Spain the appearance of a conical rock, nearly 1400 feet in perpendicular height, and separated from it only by a narrow isthmus not more than 200 paces in length. On the east, west, and south, it is washed by the Mediterranean, and precludes ascent to its summits or the intervening connecting ridge by its natural obstacles of abrupt slopes and precipices down its several sides. As a whole, therefore, it is, in the truest sense of the word, "a Barrier" (*κλειθρον*), abutting on the water, and "closing out" all approach by it to the main land.

These observations explain my reason for venturing to add the Koptic étymon in the context. *Κηλι*, or *Κηλλι*, is the synonyme of *κλειθρον*, *Δπε*, *Δφε*, or *Δπη*, of *κορυφή*. What then can be conceived more probable than that an Egyptian mariner, in the earlier age of discovery, would term this remarkable promontory, in his own vernacular, *Κηλι Ἰδαπη*, which would then become a geographical name in its contracted form *Κηλαπη*, or *Κηλη*, *καλη*?

I have ventured to propose this theme, as also that in the instance of *Abýle*, taken from the

Tartessian Gades (גַּדִּירָא, Γάδειρα*). Thence it proceeds to its final destination, touching perhaps at Olisippo, the city of "the pleasant bay" (אֵלִיץ עֵבָא). We will suppose that the helmsman, on his approaching the Kassiterídes, to avoid the dangers of their navigation, steers direct for the haven of Voliba (בְּלִי בִּלְבָא), a name which expresses well the mariner's depression of spirit after a voyage so perilous and protracted.

Koptic (which I consider as, notwithstanding its present mixed aspect, a very safe guide to the earlier Pharaonic language (vid. Peyron. Prefatt. ad Gramm. et Lexic. Copt.),) from a persuasion long since taken up by me, that in matters relating to geographical nomenclature, indeed general etymology, a much too exclusive regard has been addressed to the Shemitic dialects. It seems to have been forgotten, that the people of Egypt had ever existed at all, or if this were considered, that it had a language; for not only have Hellenic words and names been traced to those rival dialects, but many have been deduced from them which might reasonably appear to have belonged, *de facto*, to Egypt itself. I may refer to the instances of Ámmon, Ósirís, Sárapis, etc., which severally have been traced to Hebrew themes by the ingenious scholarship of VOSSIUS, FULLER, and their imitators. This has always appeared to me a very narrow view of the subject, exclusively of its being unjust to the Egyptians, to deprive them of all right to be considered as having influenced the formation of dialects so many ages junior to their own, and of peoples either at no great distance from them, or in their immediate neighbourhood. In the case of chorographical nomenclature this might appear especially unreasonable, as it appears on record that they possessed the means and the power of exerting a direct influence on this at very early periods. Diódoros reports their current tradition: Οἱ δὲ οὖν Αἰγύπτιοι φασὶ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀποικίας πλείστας ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κατὰ πᾶσαν διασπαρῆναι τὴν οἰκουμένην (B. H. I. 28. pr.), the colonies led by Dánaos and Kékrops, to speak of Greece alone, being instances. We are then informed that Sésostris, now generally identified with Remeses II., had a powerful fleet both in the Arabian Gulf, and, with a view of controlling the Phœnikians, on the Mediterranean, by which he became master of a large portion of the Kykládes (ibid. 55.); τὴν λοιπὴν Ἀσίαν ἅπασαν ὑπήκοον ἐποιήσατο, καὶ τῶν Κυκλάδων νήσων τὰς πλείστας. These events belong to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries before our era (Wilkins. 18th Dyn. vol. I. pp. 47. s.). Passing on to the Ethiopian, or twenty-fifth dynasty, in the seventh and eighth centuries, we find Tehrak, the Tirhakah of Kings, II. 19. 9., and Teárchon of Strabo, penetrating like Sésostris into Europe, and extending his conquests to the Columns of Heraklês (Strab. xv. 1. pr.). Finally, about a century after, we read of the circumnavigation of Africa under the auspices of Nekós (Heród. iv. 42.), the Necho of Scripture (Chronicl. II. 35. 20. s.), a fact which abundantly proves that the nautical zeal of the Egyptians had not expired.

* Comp. Avienus, ubi supra, 267. ss. "Gaddir hic est oppidum: Nam Punicorum lingua conseptum locum Gaddir vocabat." Voss. Anal. I. 12. p. 425.

† Ἀψυχός, "exanimis." If I be not mistaken, the ancient duchy of Cornwall retains other vestiges, exclusively of this, of the footsteps of the Phœnikian mariners on its soil. It may be that Belerium (Βελέριον of Diódoros (v. 22. pr.)) represents in a classical form the Aramaïc בְּעֵל אֲרִיזָא,

I have selected these examples, from a vast array which might be produced, of the influence exerted by a most remarkable people during its ascendancy, one doubtless not limited solely to the imposition of geographical names, but extending also to matters of social concern, the arts which adorn, and the institutions which humanize, communities. The Phœnikians were, in effect, the pioneers of their age in civilization. Actuated as they were by the restless and excursive spirit which is ever the characteristic of a nation devoted to commerce, they fulfilled their mission as instruments under the control of the Arbiter of events, more especially when their state encountered so rude a shock from the aggression of the heaven-directed Joshua, in dispensing intelligence at least, however unaccompanied by a still higher gift, amongst the rude tribes of the west.

I return now to the point from which I had set out, to place before the reader of these pages a few more instances of this commercial ubiquity which, for a period so lengthened, seemed to have been the prerogative of the Canaanitish adventurers. I shall confine myself to a very few; including, however, the most remarkable of the insular groups of the Ægæan, to the early intercourse between many of which and the Phœnikians the Hellenic writers bear ample testimony. How far the report of these witnesses is in unison with geographical designations, I propose, within the limits now stated, to inquire, following, it is true, the track of the profoundly learned BOCHART, as marked out in his "Geographia Sacra," but not treading in his footsteps; or, to express myself less metaphorically, with no servile adherence to his thematic dicta, as the course of my investigation will demonstrate. Here, however, I wish to be understood as referring to the subordinate details of his great work: for in the

from the primitive implement used by the miners of those times in working their lodes: and it appears to be certain, that the "Herculis Promontorium" of the Roman times, now "Hartland Point," was a relic of the Phœnikian, perhaps *רִאשֵׁן מֶלֶךְ קִרְדָּא*, imposed in honour of the tutelary deity of Týros, whose memorials have accompanied us in our course in Melíte, Sardó, and along the African coast.

BOCHART discovers also in the name *Kassiterides* an intimation of the presence of the Phœnikians in Cornubia, as he derives it from *קססירא* or *קיססר*, because the former occurs in the Targum by Jonathan, and the latter in that of Jerusalem, as a synonyme of *כִּדְיָל* in the Book of Numbers, xxxi. 23. This only shows how unsafe it is to trust to such guides in questions like the present, as the above are but Aramaized forms of *κασσίτερος*. Vide *Geogr. Sacr.* i. 39.

scepticism to which it owed its origin, I mean a profound distrust of the tenableness, in cases without number, of the Greek geographical themes, I largely share; in common, I believe, with most scholars who have tempered their Hellenic enthusiasm by recognising the claims of the dialects of the East.

In such inquiries as the present, I have always esteemed this to be the most philosophical course to pursue, and my reason is, independently of the requirements of the present age, characterized as it is by those large views which have resulted in the creation of a new and splendid science, that the pervading spirit of autochthonism with which illustrious Hellás was so inspired, that it conducted to a series of the most astounding events which the page of history records, had its shadows as well as its lights, as its primary impulse was to envelop in a Kimmerian darkness whatever seemed to run counter to its vain-glorious pretensions. The necessary consequence of this was, that her poets had recourse to myths, summoned into existence mythical personages, and led the way in the Hellenization of proper names, which had been unquestionably imposed by her aboriginal founders, the colonists of Egypt and the East, in the hope of their appropriating all, Language, Arts, Religion, Civilization, solely and exclusively to their beloved father-land.

This I believe to be a true statement of the habitude of thought engendered by a very noble principle, but a very narrow-sighted aspiration. It becomes, therefore, the task of the philologist to redress the balance which has been so disturbed, and hold it even between conflicting claims, so far as can be done in these instances; that of the Greek, whose choicest literature lies open before him, and that of the Tyrian colonist, whose monuments time and social catastrophe have obliterated. But this is not all. He must not forget that a third claimant also remains to be satisfied, of whom, strange to say, no account whatever has been taken in investigations such as the present. The immigrant from Egypt, I mean the Pharaonic Egypt, extending from the Ægæan to the Erythræan sea,* steps in to assert the right of his dialect to be included in our estimate. We know that the aboriginal colonists of the Argive and the Attic territories issued from that region; why then overlook the claim of their ver-

* See the article on Kýpros, *infra*, § xiv.

nacular, essentially the Koptic which has survived to our time,* to be entitled to consideration in any attempt to trace the étyma of the Ægæan islands? Yet it has never, to my knowledge, been entertained: nay, philologists have, until of late times, been accustomed to refer even the names of primeval Mitsraïm itself to Shemitic origins,† with no less injustice to the Shemitic dialects themselves than to the language into whose place they have been intruded.

The distinctive features, therefore, of the present section consist in the substitution of new themes of most of the geographical names selected for consideration in place of those which BOCHART has proposed, and in the introduction of the Khamic element as a basis of etymology. I have judged it, however, the wisest course, in an initiatory essay such as the present, to confine the last of these to a limited area, allowing the Phœnikian, with but few exceptions, undisturbed possession of its former domain as far north as I proceed, that is, to the verge of the HellésPontos. I state it, however, as my impression, that an extension of this inquiry might result in countenancing a suspicion, if not confirming a belief, that many other such names should be included in the Koptic Onomastikón.

I now proceed to the application of the foregoing remarks to a select number of the Hellenic names occurring in the Ægæan, within the limits of the Propontis and the Libyan sea, and commence with Lêmnos. I wish it to be understood previously, that the principle which has guided me in my investigations of their themes has been, in all possible cases, based upon the authenticated characteristics of each island, more especially such as are the most obvious, and, therefore, the likeliest to influence the earlier navigators in their construction of the insular nomenclature. It is, moreover, but justice to myself to add, that I traverse this beautiful region with peculiar advantages, from my being enabled not only to test in many instances the accuracy of geographers' and travellers' notices from my personal experience, but also to supply deficiencies in these wherever such occur.

* Peyron, *Gramm. Copt. Præfat.* pp. ix. s. *Lexic. Copt.* pp. xi. s. Of its use in the study of Hieroglyphics, see Mr. Sharp's "Rudiments, etc.," p. 2., and Peyron, *ubi supra*.

† Vide *supra*, note (*), p. 242. Thus FULLER derived "Ámmon," that is, the Greek form of *Ἀμμων*, from *ἄμω*, "incault"! *Ex uno disce omnia*.

I. LÉMNOS. The étymon which BOCHART* has proposed in this case is the Arabic "lama nahs" (لَمْ نَهَسَ), the first of which means "curing a wound," the second, "a wound inflicted by biting." His reason for thus travelling beyond his Phœnikian limits was the reputation which the "Lemnia terra" had acquired for its healing and antidotal properties.† I am not prepared to receive this as satisfactory, and, therefore, am disposed to prefer לֶמְנָא in its sense "nutritiv," a theme which not only possesses the advantage of keeping us within bounds which should not be transgressed unless in cases of exigency, but also accords well with the character of the island for productiveness. Hence Ovid's eulogy: "Dos tibi Lemnos erit, terra ingeniosa colenti,"‡ that is, repaying by its fruitfulness the toil of the husbandman: one to which Homer implicitly bears his testimony when describing the Lemnian prince as the bearer of so large a supply of the produce of the island to the army encamped before Ílion.§ Hence its epithet ἀμπελόεσσα.

Adopting, therefore, the above-mentioned root, and combining its Benoni-Kal with the definite article and prefix לְ, we form לֶמְנָאֵהָ, "ad nutrientem," or "nutritium," τὸν θρεπτήρηα, from which the immediate resultant is Λήμνος, by Krâsis of its medial vowels, and attaching the case-sign of the second declension. That nothing was more usual amongst the Phœnikians than designations of this kind, by mean of the inseparable prefix, will be more fully demonstrated when we come to treat of Lésbos. It has already made its appearance in the instance of another maritime name, Léptis.||

II. TÉNEDOS. The origin of this name, as assigned by BOCHART,** is based on the testimony of Plútarchos, who has commemorated the earthenware of Ténedos in the following passage: Τὴν δὲ τράπεζαν ἢ καλὴ Αὐλὶς, ἢ Τένεδος, ἀντικοσμήσει τοῖς κεραμοῖς, καθαρωτέροις οὖσι τῶν ἀργυρῶν.†† Now, as we find argillaceous clay of a red colour to be designated in Hebrew by the word אֶדְמָה, the Aramaïc אֶדְמָה, the synonyme of this, namely, אֶדְמָה יָשָׁן, "terra

* Vide Diction. Histor. p. 579. a.

† On the virtues of the σφραγὶς Λημνία see Galen. De Medicam. Simplic. in libr. ix. Μείλτος Λημνίς in Theriak. Nikandr. p. 63. Holsten. ad Stephan. Byz. p. 189. a.

‡ Heroïd. Epist. vi. 117.

§ Vide Iliád. η'. 467.

|| Supra, p. 241.

** Vide Dict. Histor. p. 963. a.

†† De vitando ære alieno, ii. This passage has been cited by the Scholiast on the "Clouds" of Aristophanes, v. 1178. Ed. Dindorf.

rubra," has appeared to BOCHART to be a very appropriate theme of the name under consideration.

The question, however, suggests itself, Was the cause here assigned of sufficient importance to lead to the effect, the imposition of a permanent geographical designation; at least, of equal importance with the known characteristic of the island, the fertility of its soil, still evidenced by the extent of its vineyards and the quality of their produce? I should reply in the negative, and prefer, therefore, an étymon analogous to that just now proposed in the case of Lēmnos, the Aramaïc ܠܡܢܐ, "terra fructus" "fructuosa;" remarking, moreover, the singular accordance of the name thus understood with the "Kálydna" of Strabo:* for ὕδνης, the primary sense of which is "humid," means in its secondary, "imparting nurture." In effect, the latter of these appellations might appear to have been neither more nor less than the Hellenic version of the former, which has retained its hold of the insular nomenclature.

The Greek traditionary theme was Τέννου ἔδος,† a compound, like many others of the same class, evidently formed from the name of which it was believed to explain the origin.

III. LÉSBOS. I resolve this name thus, Λε-σβ-ος, and consider the first member as the representative of the prefix ܠ, and the second as the equivalent of שבע or שבעא, that is, both together as the Hellenic transmutation of לשבע, supposed to have undergone retrenchment of its last two letters. This change to לשב (perhaps, in its vocalized form, להשב) we may conceive to have originated with the Phœnikians themselves: at least, we possess evidence of this application of the apokopé having been usual amongst the Aramaïc writers of more recent times; as for example, אפלחניך שב שנין, and ופלח עמיה בנינה תוב שוב שנין.‡ The case-affix had then only to be subjoined,

* In xiii. l. p. med. Καὶ αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Τένεδον Κάλυδνάν τινες εἶπον, ἄλλοι δὲ Λεύκοφρον. Comp. Q. Smyrn. Posthomer. IB'. 452. νήσοιο κατὰ πτόχας, ἣν τε Καλύδνην Λαοὶ κικλήσκουσιν. "A Tenedo," Æneid. ii. 203.

† Vide Strab. supr. Diódor. v. 83. pr. Stéphan. p. 703. Pausan. x. 14. 2.

‡ Vide Targ. Jonath. in Genes. xxix. 18. 30. Apokopé was very usual amongst the Hebrew writers in certain cases which are noted by LEE, Grammar, Lect. iii. art. 78-83. That with which we deal at present is evidently one in which considerably more latitude in the application of this licence may be expected. See POSTSCRIPT, infra p. 268.

the termination of the second declension, and Λέσβος resulted, the meaning being, with reference to the Aramaïc name, "to the seventh," that is, in magnitude: the general opinion of the earlier geographers having been, that Lésbos ranked in this order amongst the islands of the Ægean sea. For example, a passage in Strabo now lies before me, in which he quotes the authority of a previous writer: Ὡν (that is, of the Γυμνησίαι νήσοι, or Balearic group) τὴν μείζω φησὶ Τίμαιος μεγίστην εἶναι μετὰ τὰς ἑπτὰ, Σαρδῶ, Σικελίαν, Κύπρον, Κρήτην, Εὐβοίαν, Κῶρον, Λέσβον.* He expresses, it is true, his dissent from this, but, as WESSELING has correctly remarked,† all that we are concerned with is, what was the universal persuasion of the more ancient geographers; and that this was as has been already stated remains on record, however their respective catalogues may vary.‡

The use of the inseparable prefix, moreover, is in exact conformity to the Phœnikian idiom in the matter of geographical designations, of which the most cursory survey of the African territory contiguous to the Mediterranean affords numerous examples. Thus we observe, in their Latinized form, "Ad cisternas," "Ad oleastrum," "Ad sex insulas," etc., perhaps the versions of לבירין, לשת איין, לזיתא מדברא. Many other names, however, have escaped this transformation, as, for instance, the head-land of Sikellia which lay nearest to the African coast, Lilýbaion. There can be little doubt of the close adherence of this form of the name to the Phœnikian, which unquestionably was ללבאין, composed of the inseparable prefix and the Aramaïc לבאין, "leones," but signifying in the compound "Líbyes."§ Now, concerning this promontory Strabo writes thus: Τρίτη δ' ἐστὶν ἡ προσεχὴς τῇ Λιβύῃ, βλέπουσα πρὸς αὐτὴν ἅμα καὶ τὴν χειμερινὴν δύσιν, Λιλύβαιον.|| It is, perhaps, unreasonable to suppose that the illustrious geographer was ignorant of the identity in sense of the first part of this clause, and of the name with which it concludes.

* Vide xiv. 2. p. init.

† Not. in Diódor. Edit. Bipont. Tom. iii. p. 569.

‡ Ex. c. Apuleius, Ed. Bip. p. 254., has the following passage: "Ipsarum vero insularum, quæ sunt in nostro mari dignæ memoratu, Trinacria est, Eubœa, Cyprus atque Sardinia, Creta, Peloponnesus, Lesbos." Compare Diódoros as referred to in the preceding note, viz., v. 17. pr., and Nikólaos of Damaskós in libr. iii., cited by BOCHART, G. S. I. Art. "Lesbos."

§ Cp. Agatheméres as cited in the Dict. Hist. p. 586. b. Λιβόη ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων ἦν ἄγνωστοι πάνυ· ἀπὸ δὲ ἔθνους ἐπισήμου φοινικῶς ὀνομάσθησαν Λέοντες.

|| Lib. vi. 2. init.

I may observe here, that I entertain little doubt of certain designations which are familiar to Levantine travellers, having originated from this idiom of a remote antiquity. I cite a few examples: the Othomans name their capital "Stanbol" (استانبول), that is, *is τὰν (εἰς τὴν) Πόλιν*: Lēmnos has become "Stalimene" (استاليمنه), *is τὰν Λήμνον*: Cōs, "Stanko" (استانکو), *is τὰν Κῶ*: and Astypálaia, "Stampalaia" (استامپالايه), *is τὰν Πάλαιαν*.*

IV. ΕὐΒΟΙΑ. This name was unquestionably of Hellenic origin; but I doubt not my being enabled to prove that it corresponds with a singular exactness to the primitive Phœnikian designation of the island. It expresses a territory "well stocked with oxen," or "well adapted to the breeding such," in conformity to which, as will shortly appear, we find its inhabitants called by the Greeks of earlier times "Abantes," and the island itself denominated "Abantis." With this Strabo acquaints us: Οὐ μόνον δὲ Μάκρις ἐκλήθη ἡ νῆσος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀβαντίς. Εὐβοίαν γοῦν εἰπὼν ὁ Ποιητής, τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτῆς Εὐβοέας οὐδέποτε εἶρηκεν, ἀλλ' Ἀβαντας αἶε.† He proceeds then to account for this on the authority of Aristotéles: Φησὶ δ' Ἀριστοτέλης ἐξ Ἀβας τῆς Φωκικῆς Θράκας ὀρμηθέντας ἐποικῆσαι τὴν νῆσον, καὶ ἐπονομάσαι Ἀβαντας τοὺς ἔχοντας αὐτήν. He then states the opinions of other authorities, that the people were termed "Ábantes," from the name of a Hero, and the region "Εὐβοία," from that of a Heroïne, or that the latter of these names traced its origin to the βοὸς αὐλή, a cavern on the side next to the Ægean, in which Ió gave birth to Ἐραφῶς (Ἐρμῆς).‡ This account has at least the merit of bringing the name into contact with its true étymon as stated above, but involves it, in the true Hellenic spirit, in the fascinating obscurity of the mýthos.

I proceed now to interrogate the language of Phœnikía, and find in the root אבס a very satisfactory origin of both these designations. Its meaning is "sag-navit," and it appears in connexion with oxen in the well-known text, § טוב שם משור אבוס, as also in that where its derivative אבוס, "a manger," is found. || The Aramaïc plural of its Benoni Kal is אבסין, signifying, with reference to

* It only remains to be noticed, that the Hellenic origin of the name Lésbos was that of one of its early colonists who succeeded Makaréús. Diódor. v. 81. med.

† Lib. x. l. pr. The passages in Homer to which Strabo refers are, *Iliás*, β'. 536. 541. s.

‡ Vide Heródot. ii. 153. fin. 'Ο δὲ Ἀπὶς κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων γλώσσάν ἐστι Ἐραφῶς.

§ Proverbs, xv. 17.

|| Ibid. xiv. 4.

cattle, "stall-feeders;" the counterpart to which, according to the Greek inflexion of **Abas*, was **Abavres*.

According to this view, the ancient Ethnic harmonizes well with the more recent territorial name, or rather, the latter and its obsolete predecessor, "Abantis," may be said in effect to signify one and the same thing. But it appears to me that we may extend this congruity still further; for we have only to suppose the name by which this island was known to the Phœnikians to have been *רֵאִי אַבְסִין*, or one analogous to it, to arrive at a compound which, when divested of its Shemitic termination, so far resembles ἡ *Eûboûs* in sound as to warrant the supposition, that its elements assumed that form in the usual process of Hellenization; that thus, in fine, *Eûboia* and *Eûboeîs* replaced the ancient **Abavtîs* and **Abavres*. This coincidence of sound and import ceases, however, to excite surprise when we come to consider the probability of both these designations, that is, *Eûboia* and *Abantîs*, being referrible to the same root. The word *boûs*, which is the theme of the former, seems identical with *אַבּוּס*, supposing an aphaîresis of its first radical, than which, as has been observed already, nothing was more usual in the construction of derivative forms: but this *אַבּוּס* is precisely the Pahûl Concrete of *אַבּס*, which we have selected as the root of *Abantîs*.

I have now merely to observe, that the merit of the attribution of the theme *אַבּס*, in the present instance, belongs to BOCHART,* from whom I have not hesitated to adopt it under the conviction of its extreme probability. The reader will, however, perceive, that the view which has now been suggested extends its application to both the names, the ancient and the more recent, of the island under consideration. We possess in it, moreover, in addition to some others already noticed, a striking illustration of the appropriative spirit which regulated to such an extent the geographical nomenclature of the Greeks.

V. CHÍOS. I profess myself quite dissatisfied with the Aramaïc étymon which BOCHART† has assigned to this name, availing himself of a legend preserved by Ailianós‡ relating to a dragon which frequented the vicinity of mount Pelinnaîos, and occasioned much trouble to the inhabitants of the island.

* Geogr. Sacr. Lib. 1. cited in the Dict. Hist. p. 2. b.

† Ibid. p. 326. b.

‡ De Animal. xvi. 39.

He therefore has proposed שׂרפ, * "serpens," with synkopé of the second radical.

I am disposed, on the ground of numismatic evidence, to doubt very much its relation to any theme of this class; for so constantly is the type of the "Sphinx alatus" impressed on the coins of Chios, from the earliest autonomes to the latest of the Imperial times, that it may, in a measure, be regarded as its peculiar property; "Chiorum fere proprius," as ECKHEL observes, subjoining that "hujus causa typi hactenus ignoratur."†

In the absence, however, of any historical or legendary evidence, we may with perfect safety assign its adoption to intercourse with Egypt of a date long anterior to the dynasty of the Lagidai; so early indeed, as to countenance a belief that the Egyptians had formed settlements in this island in the ante-historical times of Hellás. We know that the Sphinx was one of the most sacred symbols of Egypt, an emblematical impersonation of the king, and as such associated with the "dii majores" Nef (Νεφ) and Re (Ρη), Amûn (Ἀμμων), Khem (Χημ), Phthah (Πτᾶθ), and Osiris (Ὀσιρις), in which capacity rows of them were very frequently placed before temples on either side of the dró-moi (approaches to the exterior gates), as though to imply the close connexion which subsisted between the Head of the state and its Tutelary deities.‡

But farther than this: we have the testimony of the same coins§ to the fact of Díónysos having been connected with Apóllon in the religious system of the Chians, the former of which deities was reckoned by the Greeks their representative of Ósiris, and the latter of his son Hôros (Ζωρ).|| The only mem-

* The western Aramaic is identical with this, viz., ܣܪܡ.

† Doctr. Num. Vet. Tom. II. pp. 564. s.

‡ The explanation of this symbol is stated by S. Clemens of Alexándreia, in the fifth book of his Strómata, to be "the union of vigour and intelligence," ἀληθι τε αὐτὴ μετὰ συνέσεως, P. 567. A. Ed. Sylburg. 1641. Accordingly it symbolizes "the mundane harmony," τὴν τοῦ κόσμου ἁρμονίαν, P. 571. A. In a preceding passage he informs us, that they were set up before temples in order to express the mysterious character of their (the Egyptians') theology: πρὸ τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς σφίγγας ἰδρύνονται ὡς αἰνιγματώδους τοῦ περὶ Θεοῦ λόγου καὶ ἀσαφοῦς ὄντος. P. 561. c. The expressions of Plútarchos are almost precisely the same. Vide Is. et Osir. Tom. II. p. 354. B. s. Ed. Xyland. 1620.

Compare with these Sir G. WILKINSON, in vols. III. p. 23., IV. 416., V. 200. s.

§ Eckhel, ubi supra, p. 565. b.

|| Comp. Plútarch. Is. et Osir. 13. 37. Diódor. I. 25. Macrob. in Saturnal. I. 21. Wilkinson, ubi supra, IV. p. 348.

ber, therefore, of the triad which was worshipped at Philai now wanting, is Isis (Ἥσις), and her we can supply from a Chian titulus which Böckh* has edited from SPON and FABRETTI. I transcribe the portion of this which is most material at present, as elucidating and, so far as it goes, confirming what has been stated respecting the Egyptian colonization of Chíos: ΘΡΑΣΕΑΣ . ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ . ΥΠΕΡ . ΕΑΥΤΟΥ . ΚΑΙ . ΤΩΝ . ΤΕΚΝΩΝ . ΚΑΙ . ΤΗΣ . ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ . κ. τ. ἐξ. ΙΣΙΔΙ . ΣΕΡΑΠΙΔΙ . ΑΝΟΥΒΙΔΙ . ΑΡΠΟΚΡΑΤΕΙ . ΘΕ ΟΙΣ . ΣΥΝΝΑΟΙΣ . ΚΑΙ . ΣΥΝΒΩΜΟΙΣ . ΕΥΧΗΝ. The deity here mentioned under the name of Sérapis, that is, Οὐσιρῶπι, merely represented Ósirís under a new character, as having undergone a change of existence, and become the judge of Amenti (Δαετῆ) or Hádes.† Ánubis was the coadjutor of Hôros in weighing the merits of the departed in the presence of Sárapis,‡ and Harpokrátes, the infant Hôros, whom Ísis bore to Ósirís after his death, or change of existence.§ The epithet *συνβώμοις*, with which the titulus concludes, affords a remarkable illustration of the above-mentioned Chian type of the common altar between Diónysos and Apóllon.

The inference which I would deduce from all this is, that Chíos had its idol-system by direct colonization from Egypt, in the same way that Athénai had its Tutelary, the Neïth of Sáïs,|| and thus became an *νηπινηθε*, “a house (or home) of Neïth,” or *παπηθε*, “sacred to Neïth.” Let us now suppose that Chíos stood in the same relation to Ósirís, or the triad of contemplar deities of whom he was the first in rank, it would be denominated *παουσιρι*, or, substituting his title *χοις*, or *χοεις*, “Dominus,” *παπχοεις*. This would be the

* Corp. Inscriptt. Tom. II. p. 208. n. 2230. FABRETTI acknowledges his having had it from SPON: Inscr. Antiq. Cap. VI. n. 183. p. 493.

Such tituli as this are only valuable as evidence when taken connectedly with authentic records of an unquestionably prior date, inasmuch as Chíos does not stand alone in the possession of such memorials of the cult of Egyptian deities. Moreover, the very mention of Sérapis in an inscription, proves that it could not have preceded the time of Sotér. Cp. Plútarch. Is. et Osir. § 28. Fascic. Inscriptt. Tom. III. n. CDXIX. b. 6., and the note, p. 358. Wilkinson, IV. pp. 360. ss.

† Plútarch. Is. et Osir. ubi supra: Βέλτιον δὲ τὸν Ὀσίριν εἰς ταυτὸ συνάγειν τῷ Διονύσῳ, τῷ τ' Ὀσίριδι τὸν Σάραπιν, ὅτε τὴν φύσιν μετέβαλε, ταύτης τυχόντι τῆς προσηγορίας. Cp. Diódoros and Wilkinson, ubi supra.

‡ Wilkinson, IV. p. 401.

§ Plútarch. ubi supra, § 19. fin. § 68. med.

|| Cp. Pláton in Tímaios, p. 21. e. Diódor. I. 28.

complete designation; but we may conceive the process of Hellenization dispensing with both the definite and possessive articles, and retaining only **Χοῖς**, which would at once give **Χῖος** by a transposition of its vowels, and a change of the "Djandja" into "Chi," still very usual in the Koptic orthography.*

Having incidentally alluded to *Athênai*, I may take occasion here to observe, that the origin of this name also has been ascribed to its Tutelary deity, the Saitic *Neïth*;† an opinion in which I entirely concur; but, as I conceive that it has neither attracted sufficient consideration, nor been placed upon its proper basis, I may be allowed to pause for a few moments to ascertain how far it enlists probability on its side.

I take it for granted that none will question the reasonableness of supposing, as I have already done, that *Kékrops* would regard, perhaps designate, his newly founded city as an **κῆρυκεῖον**, precisely as his countrymen denominated one of their cities **κῆρυκεῖον**, "mansion of Threbi." Now, as we are certain that the last of these had received the form **Θερμεῖον**‡ from the Egyptians themselves, we feel warranted in supposing by analogy that the former would be written and pronounced **Θημεῖον**, a designation essentially the same with the **Παρθενών** of the ancient Athenians, the sole difference between them consisting in the substitution of **Παρθένος**, the Title, for **Ἥμεῖον**, that is 'Αθηνᾶ, the Name. One signifies literally "the chamber of the Virgin;" the other, "the abode of *Neïth*." Scholars are aware that in the sacred language of the Athenians, 'Η **Παρθένος** was synonymous with 'Αθηνᾶ, precisely as 'Η **Κόρη** was with **Περσεφόνη**:§ and the following considerations may tend to induce a belief that 'Αθηνᾶ was purely a modification of **Ἥμεῖον**.

If we are to attach any credit to the accounts which were current amongst the Athenians themselves respecting the ante-historical times of their state, we must believe that the dynasty of their Founder expired with his own life, as the next occupant of the throne was wholly unconnected with him, at least by birth.|| A few generations then elapsed, during which, what with changes in the

* Peyron, Lexic. Copt. p. 375. b.

† Vide Wilkinson, ubi supra, i. p. 47. note §, iv. p. 284.

‡ Fascic. III. Ind. Copt. p. 399. a.

§ Vide supra, p. 188.

|| Viz. *Kranaós*; from whom the citizens of the Kekropian state were denominated *Kranaói*, as they had before been styled *Kekropídai*, from their founder (*ἀρχηγός, κτίστης*) *Kékrops*, and after-

succession, and perhaps the immigration of new races, the remembrance of the Saïtic colonization becomes gradually more and more faint, until at last it merges

wards Erechtheîdai from Erechtheús, Theseîdai from Theseús, and Kodrídai from Kódros. Comp. Heródot. viii. 44. Stéphan. in Athênai, p. 44. Complete lists of all these dynasties will be found in Eusébios, Can. Chronic. pp. 361. ss. Edit. Scaliger. 1658., and in Pausanias, by comparing i. 2. 3. 5. 17. 19., ii. 18., iii. 18., vii. 25., x. 25.

With these, however, I am not at present concerned; farther at least than regards the development of language. Heródotos informs us (*ubi supra*, and i. 56.) that the Athenians were of Pelasgic descent, the Lakedaimonians of Hellenic, and expresses it as his opinion, that the former forsook their primitive language (*μετέμυθον τὴν γλῶσσαν*) on their entering the Hellenic family. He then speculates on the subject of this aboriginal dialect, the Pelasgic, from the analogy of that of the people of Krestôn, but concludes with confessing candidly, *ἦν τινα δὲ γλῶσσαν ἔεσαν οἱ Πελασγοί, οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἶπαι*. (*ubi supra*, 57).

It is greatly to be regretted that the illustrious historian did not prosecute this research further, as he flourished during a period when it might have been pursued under peculiarly favourable circumstances. He might, by following up his inquiry, have bequeathed us a solution of a problem of the highest moment in glossology, namely, to what extent the affiliated dialects of those nomadic tribes of the Japhethic race who "divided the isles," that is, the maritime regions of the western hemisphere, amongst them, were severally effective in originating those of Western Asia and the European continent. At least, he might have supplied most important information respecting two of the number, the primitive Pelasgic and Hellenic. I say, most important, because I regard these languages, in themselves distinct specific types, as the parents severally of the two great families, which with the Slavonic divide Europe between them, the Keltic and the Germanic.

The first we know to a certainty to have been the vernacular of a large portion of the territory which was in course of time occupied afterwards by the Hellenic races: but it must of necessity have been greatly modified by the intrusions at distinct periods of the Egyptian and Phœnikian colonists. The natural effect of these immigrations would be, in the case of the Athenians, the formation of a composite dialect, with a predominance in favour of the Egyptian element, more particularly if we are to attach any credit to the assertion of the people of Egypt, namely, that not only Kékrops, but also Kranaós, Erechtheús, and Pétes belonged to them, insomuch that an unbroken succession of Egyptian dynasties ruled Attiká, until the sovereignty passed to Mélanthos, the father of Kódros. Comp. Diódoros, i. 28. s.

It is likely that about this time the Hellenic element entered into the Athenian language, and that thus the foundation of the Ionico-Hellenic was laid, to be so widely diffused in the course of time by the migrations of the Kodrídai headed by Neileús.

I may here take occasion to recur to my former observations on the injury caused to Ethnology by those who would discountenance any attempt to trace affinities between the Greek and the Oriental tongues: for thus, supposing what can hardly be questioned, that the Héllenes and the Pelasgoí were distinct branches of the Japhethic family, they would deprive us of the

into oblivion, in consequence of the growing spirit of autochthonism, which invested every true-born Athenian with the dignity of being the offspring of his native soil. The better to countenance this persuasion, the order of tradition itself was reversed: Sais, instead of being accounted the Parent, became the Daughter,*

most lucid commentary attainable under our present circumstances, on statements respecting the ante-historical times of Greece, of which therefore Tradition is the sole voucher. I remark, however, that the denomination "Hellenic," as defined by the sober-minded historian (Thukydíd. i. 3.), has been of rather an injurious tendency, it being confined to a geographical space far too circumscribed in its dimensions to be in any degree commensurate to its importance in a glossal sense. But the ethnic "Pelagic" is not so; and this it owes to its greater vagueness of application, its far less straitened geographical limits, a circumstance which invests it with its proper ethnological dignity: for I have always been accustomed to reckon it a generic (possibly a sub-generic) name for the vast variety of dialects which glossologists seem disposed to term Keltic, throughout the southern regions of Europe, that is, Greece, Italy, Spain, France, and penetrating northwards to the British isles. But to denominate from a spot like Hellás . . . I here speak of the Phthiotic Hellás . . . a language whose affinities we can trace from the Mediterranean to the shores of the Baltic, has always appeared to me preposterous.

To descend now to our chief concern at present: I conceive that to the Pelagic, primarily, then to the Khamic, imported into Attiká and the Pelopónnesos, and subsequently to the Phœnikian type of the Shemitic tongues, our classical Hellenic owes its radical terms; that to these were superadded, in process of time, large contributions from the primitive, or Indo-Hellenic, but particularly its system of inflexions, at first, as might appear from the oldest specimens which we possess of those closely allied types, the Doric and Æolic, crude and inartificial, but moulded afterwards by the potent influence of a higher physical existence into the forms of the smooth and flowing Ionic.

According to this view, which has been adopted in conformity to the current traditional history of Greece, the classical Hellenic owes to the archaic dialect of the same name its very remarkable affinity to the Sanskrit; for I conceive that both these last were sub-genera, branching out from a still older language, which was also the parent of the ancient Persic, the Medo-Persic, and their derivatives, so far as my personal research has extended, the ante-hellenic dialects of western Asia. I have, therefore, taken the liberty of distinguishing the archaic language of Hellás by the title "Indo-Hellenic," feeling persuaded, that in this I shall have the concurrence of those eminent scholars who have devoted attention to the structural formation of the Greek. With regard to its more fundamental connexion with the Pelagic, the most ancient representatives of which were the dialects of Central Italy, I solicit the attention of those distinguished philologists who have of late years earned such well-merited applause by their researches, not less patriotic than they have proved successful, into our Ibero-Keltic literature.

* Cp. Diódor. v. 57. med. and Wesseling's note on l. 28. 6.

Kékrops himself an "Autóchthon,"* and Neith lost her indigenous characteristics† of the flower-topped sceptre, and the crown of the Lower Egypt, to become symbolized by the Olive and attended by the Owl, the tree and bird of Attiká. It only remained to bind her still more closely to Hellás by assigning her an Hellenic name, but, from a religious scruple, such an one as might still retain her primitive appellation in the form, so to speak, of a root. This may be conceived to have been effected in the following manner.

Scholars versed in Hellenic palæography are aware, that during the transition of the Greek language from its rudimentary, or more Oriental, form, a mode of writing was adopted conformable to the course of oxen when ploughing, *βουστροφιδόν*,‡ which was, in effect, a species of compromise between the Eastern fashion of writing from right to left, and what was regarded by the Hellenes as the practice of happier omen,§ the adopting the contrary direction. In this way we may suppose the name of our Tutelary, when occurring in one of the regressive (right-left) lines of a Bustrophedón, with the Hellenic termination, to have been written ΑΘϑΑΥ. The next process, as I conceive, and a very obvious one, would be to reverse the position of each letter in this so as to give it the form ΑΘϑΕΥ: || then it only remained to superadd the feminine termination so as to constitute it a new name. In the progress of time, when the long vowel-forms were introduced, the third letter of this would disappear, or rather be absorbed into the Êta, and the result would be the name as it appears

* Vide Apollódor. III. 14. 1. Κέκροψ αὐτόχθων --- τὴν πρότερον λεγομένην Ἀκτὴν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ Κεκροπίαν ὠνόμασεν.

† Wilkinson, vol. iv. pp. 284. s. Engravings of this deity, with her several characteristic emblems, have been given in the supplementary volume, Plate 28.

‡ Pausanías has described this style of writing, when commencing his description of the "Chest of Kýpselos," in v. 17. 3., and concludes with likening it to the course of the racer in the δίαυλος. We are told also, that the laws of Sólon (ἄξωνες) were written in this manner, by Harpokration and Suidas. See also Phótios in Lexik. p. 237.

Böckh has several examples in C. Inscr. I. nn. 1. 8. 22. 23. etc.

§ Vide Thiersch's "Grammar," Introduction, § 10.

|| I have introduced these characters, the oldest specimens of the Greek palæography extant, chiefly for the purpose of affording my readers some idea of its archaic forms. It is impossible not to be struck with the Phœniko-Samaritan aspect of the first, fourth, and last letters, when reversed: no slight corroboration of the origin of the Hellenic letters as assigned by tradition. See the Alphabets given from medals by Eckhel, in his "Doctr. Num. V." III. p. 404.

in Homer, ΑΘΗΝΗ, or ΑΘΗΝΑ, from which the name of the city would be formed, just as ΘΗΒΑΙ had originated from ΘΑΒΑ.*

All this was necessarily the work of time, but proved in the end very effective in accomplishing its object, which was, to invest with the grandeur of the Μῦθος the nascent condition of the Athenian state, and thus bar all access to the popular convictions against the plain and homely truth. This, it is true, was a boon to the proud and vainglorious citizen; to be spared the wound to his self-love of being taught that the emblem of his Tutelary had received its first nurture from the soil of an Egyptian town.

To return to our Ionian island, to the colonization of which also it might appear from the unquestionable evidence of its medals, that Egypt had primarily contributed . . . I have only to add to the étymon of its name proposed above another resting on a basis wholly distinct. I here mean the aspect which it presents to the navigator, before whose view the heights of Pelinnaïos render it one of the most conspicuous objects in the Ægæan. I might cite authorities in support of this, but the vivid impression which the outline of this beautiful island has left on my memory, first when sailing from Constantinople to Smýrna, and afterwards through the straits to Sýros, disinclines me to resort to such vouchers.† I conclude, therefore, with suggesting that the Koptic root χίϥε, written also ϫίϥι, and signifying "to raise up," "exalt," supplies a theme very applicable to this case, in its derivative forms χίϥε, χίϥι, or ϫίϥι, "Height," "Loftiness," or with the participial prefix, ετχοϥε, ετϫοϥι, "elevated." These last would of course, in the process of Hellenization, sustain an aphaíresis of the prefix syllable, and the remainder would, as in the case of χοϥιϥ, or ϫϥ, ϫοϥιϥ, at once supply Χίος.

BOCHART‡ has derived the name of the most conspicuous object in the island, Mount Pelinnaïos, from the Dragon mentioned in the beginning of this article, resolving it into the Aramæan elements פלִיא נחש, "stupendus serpens." This adoption of a legendary theme seems to me by no means to satisfy the requirements of a permanent chorographical designation, which would rather be selected in conformity to some permanent characteristic of the object or place to be designated. Now precisely such an one, in the case of Pelinnaïos, is the

* Vide Fascic. III. Ind. Copt. p. 401.

† Vide p. 259. notes (*) and (†).

‡ In Dict. Histor. nom. "Pelinaeus," p. 758. b.

brilliant appearance of its peak when the sun has newly risen, or, as I have witnessed it, just before his descent : and I am much mistaken if the fragments of a Koptic appellation correspondent to this aspect of the mountain cannot be detected in its Hellenic. These I proceed to trace, but previously observe, that the orthography of this name varies exceedingly, and that this very circumstance is an advantage on the side of the etymist in pursuing his investigation. It appears in Strabo thus ; τὸ Πελινναῖον ὄρος ὑψηλότατον τῶν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ.* In Dionýsios ; Καὶ Χίος ἡλιβάτου Πελληναίου ὑπὸ πέζαν.† His commentator, Eustáthios, writes it Παλινναῖον. Hesýchios has Πελληναῖος, ὁ Ζεὺς ἐν Χίῳ ; and Stéphanos, Πελληναῖον, ὄρος Χίου,‡ agreeing with the Periegetés. The Scholiast on Píndaros§ writes it Πελινναῖον ; Plinius, “ Pellenæus.”||

This being premised, I adopt, as my basis, with apokopé of the Hellenic termination, Πελινναι, and divide it into what appear to me to have been its separate members, thus, Π’-ελιν-ναι. I have marked the first with apóstrophos at the beginning and end, to show that I conceive it to have been the representative of Δπε, signifying “ cacumen.” The last, ναι, I regard as identical with the Koptic π̄νι, precisely as Αἰ-γυπτος represented amongst the Greeks π̄νι π̄κειπτο, the definite article and case-prefix being suppressed in the transformation. This ηι I conceive to have been the origin of the Hellenic αἶα, or γαῖα, with the digammic aspiration. I come now to the intermediate member, ελιν, or ελην, which I hold to be the representative of ειελελ, or ιελελ, “ brightness,” “ effulgence,” supposing an apharesis of its first syllable and an assimilation of the second Laula to Ni on account of this letter immediately following. These changes, which unquestionably violate no rule of thematic combination, result in the compound Πελεπ̄νι, the abbreviated form of ΤΔπε π̄ιελελ π̄νι, “ the resplendent peak of the country,” and through it in the Hellenic from which I set out, or the variations thereof, Πελινναῖος, Πελληναῖος, etc., mentioned above.

The most direct mode of removing any dissatisfaction with the extent of these changes is to cite a recognised example, for instance, Τέντυρα. This town was so denominated from being the chief seat in Egypt of the cult of Athor. The Koptic form of its name, in the Thebaïc dialect, was Τεντωρε, thema-

* Lib. xiv. l. in “ Chíos.”

† Vs. 535.

‡ P. 634.

§ Not. in Pyth. x. 7.

|| V. 38. 1.

tically, **Τηῖϛδωρ**, which itself becomes, by the substitution of the components of **δωρ**, **Τηῖπτηῖδωρ**. Let us now remark the changes effected in this result, in order to the production of **Τεπτωρε**: firstly, **η** is replaced with **ε**; then follows a synkopé of **ηη**; thirdly, **τδ** is converted into **θ** (in the Memphite form **Τεθωρι**); and lastly, the plural termination **ε** is added, which the Greeks represented by their above-mentioned form **Τέντυρα**.*

VI. **Σάμος**. There can be no doubt entertained of the Shemitic origin of this name, as the Greeks themselves confess that wherever it occurs it is constantly accompanied with the circumstance of Height, or commanding position. Let us take, in the first instance, Samothráke, which (to cite Diódoros) *ἐνιοί φασιν τὸ παλαιὸν Σάμον ὀνομασθῆναι*,† and this not because it was a colony of the Ionian **Σάμος**, but because *πιθανώτεροί εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ Σάμου καλεῖσθαι τὰ ὕψη φήσαντες εὐρήσθαι τοῦτο τοῦνομα τὴν νῆσον*.‡ That such a cause existed in the instance of Samothráke he proves by Homer having introduced Poseidôn as selecting it for his point of observation during the conflicts of the contending hosts in the *Ιλιάς*.§

Secondly, that the Ionian **Σάμος** was entitled on this ground to its designation is likewise demonstrable from Strabo: *Μέρος δέ τι καὶ εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἀνέχει τὸ ὑπερκείμενον*.|| The conspicuousness of this high land from the sea-level sufficiently accounts for its name, as characteristic of loftiness. So also, thirdly, in the case of the Eleian **Σάμος**: *Τὸ μὲν οὖν Σαμικόν ἐστὶν ἔρμα· πρότερον δὲ καὶ πάλαι Σάμος προσαγορευομένη διὰ τὸ ὕψος ἴσως, ἐπειδὴ Σάμους ἐκάλουν τὰ ὕψη*,** in accordance with what he had before stated with respect to the Thracian.

The **Σάμος** which has been mentioned by Homer in his review of the Armies,†† as also in the *Odysseia*,‡‡ and is proved by Strabo to have been the ancient name of **Κεφλληνία**,§§ is entitled to the same geographical distinction: for Strabo's description of this island is, *μακρὰ ἀνήκουσα πρὸς εὐρον, ὀρεινὴ· μέγιστον δ' ὄρος ἐν αὐτῇ Αἶνος*.|||

From what precedes I coincide with **BOCHART***** in his inference, that

* Fascic. Inscr. Græc. Tom. III. p. 406. a.

† V. 47. init.

‡ Strabo, x. 2.

§ Vide ν. 10. sa.

|| xiv. 1. Comp. Clarke's Travels, vol. III. p. 365. 4to. Edition.

** viii. 3.

†† β'. 634.

‡‡ δ'. 671. 845.

§§ x. 2.

||| Ibid.

*** Dict. Histor. p. 872. b.

σάμος is referrible to the same root with the Hebrew שָׁמַיִם, its Aramaic form שָׁמַיִשׁ, and the Arabic سمايا or سماءات, and سامي. That root was perhaps the adverb שָׁם used in a demonstrative or emphatic sense.

VII. ΠÁTMOS. I resume the consideration of this name for the purpose of submitting to my readers certain results with regard to it at which I have lately arrived. When I adopted the étymon proposed by BOCHART,* with a very decided expression of my conviction of its truth, my attention had not been directed to the probability of Khamic themes entering so largely as I am now convinced they do into the Hellenic designations throughout the Ægæan. At least, I had allowed them a very circumscribed range, one more immediately in the vicinity of Egypt itself, that is, not extending beyond Kréte and Kýpros. I soon, however, found reason, on extending my researches, to push forward these landmarks; for having proceeded to interpret the names of other islands much more remote by means of Koptic combinations, I became more and more confirmed in my opinion, that the Ægyptians of the Pharaonic ages, while pursuing the march of conquest and colonization over these regions, had impressed on those names memorials of both their language and superstition.†

In the instance now before us, the first Koptic theme which occurred to me was suggested by the name “Palmosa,” attributed to Pátmos by Sophianus.‡ This must necessarily have originated in what we may denominate an arbustal feature of the island, precisely as Virgil has termed his Sicilian town “palmosa Selinus;”§ and it is obviously open to conjecture, in the absence of any express authority on its behalf, that “Palmosa,” as a geographical name, may have been a version of an ancient Hellenic one, Φοινικῆ or Φοινίκηα. Be this as it may, it is impossible to overlook its exact correspondence to the Koptic Βα-τμοϣ, or in the Memphitic form Βα-εμοϣ, the first element of which signifies “Palma,” and the second “Insula.” Hence arose the different modifications stated in the former section of the Memoir|| relative to this island, the Hellenic Πάτμος, perhaps written also Πάθμος, and the Helleno-Arabic بطمس, according as the Thebaïc or Memphitic dialects were used as archetypes, or a mixture of both these. We perceive also how immediately the last of these

* Supra, p. 204.

† Comp. supr. pp. 245. s., 254. note (||).

‡ Dict. Histor. p. 755. a.

§ Æneis, iii. 705.

|| P. 204. and note (§), ibid.

forms led to βαθμός, and through this to the legend embodied in the seventh and eighth verses of our Patmian inscription.

I now direct attention to the physical aspect of the island, as described by the accomplished traveller whose expressions have been already cited at length,* and for the faithfulness of which I can vouch. The phenomena which attracted his notice,—the charred aspect of the cliffs, and the different vents of volcanic action, are too obvious to escape the observation of even the most cursory spectator; to which we may add, that possibly the forces now slumbering may have exhibited to the eyes of the Egyptian, during the primitive age of which we now treat, unquestionable proofs of their energy. Hence he would naturally style the volcanic areas as ΒΗ-ΤΑΞΟ (fully expressed, ΒΗ Π-ΤΑΞΟ) “sepulcra incendi,” equivalent to “volcanic graves:” or a designation embracing the whole island might be found in ΠΑ-ΤΑΞΟ, meaning literally, “devoted to conflagration.”

VIII. DÉLOS. This island I hold to be the indisputable property of the Phœnikians, so far at least as its name is concerned; and I esteem it as probable, that the Hellenic cult of Apóllon and Ártemis, the principal seat of which was Délos, originated in the Phœnikian, of Astárte (עשתרת) and Melikarthos† (מלך קרתא). I have, therefore, no more material observation to offer respecting the étymon which I have already adopted‡ than this, that I think its synonyme דלול accounts equally well for the geographical designation “Délos,” and better for the myth in relation to the island which we owe to the invention of the Greeks. The reason is; because its root דלל not only signifies “to dread,” “to be affrighted,” “to terrify,” but also “to draw forth,” “raise up,” being thus in one of its senses a synonyme of דלל, itself very probably the theme of Ἀν-τάλειω. The mythologists, as is well known, ascribed the name Δῆλος to the event of the island’s having ceased its subsultory movements, and become fixed to a certain position; but we now perceive that the myth was a superfluous exercise of the imagination, inasmuch as the Pehil concrete דלל, in its meaning “upraised,” furnished a sufficient explanation: not, however, satisfactory to the original Hellenizers, who wished, while affixing the name, to keep its Aramæan original out of sight.

* Supra, p. 218.

† Euseb. Præp. Ev. p. 38. A. C.

‡ Supra, p. 217.

Strabo writes concerning Délos: "Ἐνδοξον δ' ἐποίησαν αὐτὴν αἱ περιοικίδες νῆσοι καλούμεναι Κυκλάδες,"* which we find in a versified form in Dionýsios, Δῆλον ἐκυκλώσαντο, καὶ οὖνομα Κυκλάδες εἰσί.† The words of Mela are an echo of this: "Quia in orbem jacent Cyclades dictæ."‡ Those of Solinus are more precise and conformable to the fact: "Cycladas autumant inde dictas, quia, licet spatiis longioribus a Delo projectæ, in orbem tamen circa Delum sitæ sunt."§ The truth is, that Sýros, respect being had to its position alone, had a much better right to be denominated the central island, or, so to speak, the Nucleus, of the assemblage, from which I infer, that this honour had been conceded to Délos in consequence of its distinction as the chosen seat of peculiar religious observances, of which the cult of the Letoïdai in the Hellenic times was merely a continuation.

This, however, supposes that the early navigators of the Ægæan were influenced in their selection of Délos, a spot in itself so insignificant, for this honour, by religious motives. It would, perhaps, be stating the case more correctly to say, that the convenience of its position for mercantile transactions, added to its possession of a good rendezvous for shipping, were their primary inducements. On this Strabo writes: 'Ἐκεῖσε μετεχώρησαν οἱ ἔμποροι, καὶ τῆς ἀτελείας τοῦ ἱεροῦ προκαλουμένης αὐτοῦς, καὶ τῆς εὐκαιρίας τοῦ λιμένος· ἐν καλῷ γὰρ κεῖται τοῖς ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν πλέουσιν· ἡ δὲ πανήγυρις ἐμπορικόν τι πρᾶγμά ἐστιν.‖ Now, what was advantageous in the Roman times had been equally so in the Phœnikian; and this I conceive to have led primarily to the distinguished position amongst the Kykladic islands ever afterwards maintained by Délos, that enterprising people having made it a settlement, and with a view of promoting its prosperity, granted it immunities founded on a religious basis. Hence the ἀτέλεια to which Strabo refers as so attractive to the merchants of his age.

The Tyrian and Sidonian mariners possessed, doubtless, their charts of so important an area as the Ægæan: it could not have escaped their observation how its islands were grouped. Of these the most interesting, in a commercial

* x. 5. Dél.

† Descr. Orb. v. 125. So Kallímachos, iv. 198. s. Σὺ δ' Εὐβοίῃθε κατῆσαι Κυκλάδας ὀψομένη περιηγέας.

‡ Lib. ii. post med.

§ Polyhist. xi. 17.

‖ Lib. x. 5. ubi supr. extr.

point of view, was that assemblage which lay nearest to the European coast, bounded by Ándros, Kéos, Mêlos, Náxos, and Mýkonos. The outlying islands from Théra to Ténedos* were scattered in no definite order over the expanse of the Ægean. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose, that they were the first to separate these groups, and impose on each designations appropriate to its form, that is, that they would style the compact Kykladic system in some such way as אִי גִלְגִּל, with reference to their orbicular outline, and the Sporadic, as אִי פִזִּירִין, from their irregular grouping. These denominations would of course be adopted from the arbiters of geographical nomenclature, and when the Greeks replaced the Phoenicians, Hellenized, that is, אִי גִלְגִּל, or rather its Syriac form אִי גִלְגִּל† would furnish them with Κυκλάς, Κυκλάδες, and אִי פִזִּירִין or פִּזִּירִיא, by transposition of the first two radicals‡ and conversion of the first Yôd into Vaû, § אִי פִזִּירִין, אִי פִזִּירִיא, with Σποράδες.||

IX. AMORGÓS. I concur with Böckh** in deriving the name of this island from ἀμόργη, and the question becomes, in what sense we are to receive it, whether as signifying a plant yielding a purple dye for which Amorgós was especially celebrated, or the colouring matter itself. Eustáthios†† explains it Πορφύρα κατὰ γλῶσσαν, which is hardly consistent with the words of another commentator, ‡‡ Ἀμόργη, εἶδος βοτάνης πορφυρᾶς, namely, of the plant in ques-

* Stéphan. De Urb. p. 703. Τένεδος, νῆσοι τῶν Σποράδων, ὡς Ἐκαταῖος ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῃ.

† Cp. Buxtorf. in Lexic. Chald. in voc. גִּלְגִּל, pp. 90. a.

‡ Vide Lee's "Grammar," Lect. III. Art. 38.

§ Ibid. Art. 86.

|| It is clear that what has here been stated as to the origins of Κυκλάς and Σποράς applies to their respective allied forms. The one series, beginning with κύκλος, find their ultimate theme in גִּלְגִּל, and the other, through σπείρω, in פִּזִּיר with metáthesis of its first radicals. I have chosen to commence with the concretes, in the text, as being at present concerned with them alone, and wishing also to exhibit their analogy to the Aramaic forms "in statu emphatico."

** Staatshaush. d. Athen. vol. i. p. 141.

†† Vide Scholiast. Aristophan. Lysistrat. v. 140. Κἄν τοῖς χιτωνίοισι τοῖς ἀμοργίνοις. These χιτωνία received their distinctive name from their having been manufactured from the fibre of the ἀμοργίς, a species of fine flax (λίνοκαλάμη, perhaps a Býssos) which grew on the island, and had its name from it. The ἀμόργη was principally used in dying this. See the Lysistráte, 735. ss., and Berkel. in Stephan. p. 120. note 21.

‡‡ Vide Scholiast. Aristoph. ubi supra.

It may be interesting to remark, that the Amorgiotes make use at present of the Archil, or

tion. There is no way of reconciling these discrepancies unless by supposing that, in popular language, the plant and its product were known by the same name: yet even this does not decide to which of them it was first applied. The probability, however, is that the latter . . . the marketable commodity . . . was earliest styled so; in corroboration of which we may cite the instance of "Amurca," the Latin form of Ἀμόργη, which certainly is never found with the signification "plant" attached to it.

Receiving it, therefore, in this sense, we can easily trace it to a Phœnikian origin. Whether ἀμόργη means "the watery refuse of the olive," or "the dregs of the oil extracted from it," or "a purple dye,"* it is properly referred as an Hellenic transformation, in the first instance, to ἀμέργω† as its theme. This verb means "to extract by pressure," and is separable into the two parts, the intensive α, and μέργω, the form in which it exists in Latin, evidently referrible to the root מרג, "to use force," "impel." The Prefix is analogous to the Heëmantic נ, a property of which, when used in this way, is to enhance the meaning of the word thus augmented.‡ My reasoning, therefore, is, that the Phœnikians denominated by a term (probably אמורנא) formed Heëmantically from the Aramæan מרג, the purple extract which, doubtless, constituted a valuable article of their commerce, and from it gave the island its name; then subsequently that the Greeks followed this succession in their ἀμέργω, ἀμόργη, and ἀμοργός.

Let us now take the other sense in which ἀμόργη seems to have been used, namely, εἶδος βοτάνης. This might also, from the process to which it was subjected, have been derived from מרג, but not so naturally as ἀμόργη, the dye. I therefore select a different root, that is, ארג, signifying "texuit," to which I

Lichen Roccella, to colour their textures. This grows in great perfection on the rocks of their island, and is most probably the very plant now under consideration, with which, in all likelihood, the φύκος θαλάσσιον of Théophrastos and Dioskurides may also be identical.

* Passow makes no mention of this, but notices the first two in his "Handwört. d. Gr. Sprach." i. p. 112. a.

† Vide A Lennep. "Origines," etc., edit. Scheid. p. 900. in Londin. Scapul. 1820. Passow. ubi supra. Both these lexicographers notice co-ordinately with ἀμέργω its cognates ἀμελγω, mulgeo, which are equally referrible to an Aramæan root, מלג.

‡ Vide Lee's "Hebrew Grammar," Lect. vii. Art. 165. 2, 7.

find subordinated the Aramaic term אַרְנַנְנָא with the meaning "purple." With this I connect אַרְנָא, and thus form a compound very likely to be used, in the spirit of the Oriental metaphor, to designate the plant from which the dye was procured, namely, אַרְנַנְנָא אַרְנָא, "mater purpuræ." In the process of Hellenizing this, we may conceive the Serviles to have been rejected in order to form ἀμόργη, and it is difficult to overlook the resemblance of the whole to ἀμόργυος.*

BOCHART arrives at his conclusion respecting the theme of Amorgós at once, by uniting אַרְנָא to the Benoni Péal of אַרְנָא, thus obtaining אַרְנַנְנָא-אַרְנָא, "Mater textorum," as the Phœnikian designation of the island.† The advantage of the preceding views is, that they deduce the name from a natural phenomenon: to which I may add, that the first is recommended by its superior simplicity.

X. PHOLÉGANDROS. The great uncertainty as to the orthography of this name renders it a matter of some difficulty to assign any étymon to it which will apply to all cases. Thus Strabo writes it Φολέγανδρος; Ptolemaïos, Φιλόκανδρος; Stéphanos, Φολέγανδρος; Hesýchios, Φλέγανδρος; Plinius, "Phalegandros."‡ Πολύκανδρος, which the Greeks of the present day have retained, appears to have been a variation of much more recent date than any of the preceding.

Hesýchios describes it, in the passage referred to above, as a desert island, νῆσος ἐρήμη; and Antípatros, apostrophizing the Kykládes, classes it with Síphnos: Σίφνον ἐμμήμασθε, καὶ αὐχμηρὰν φολέγανδρον Τλήμονες, ἀρχαίην ὕψιόν αἰετῶν,§ that is, squalid from its drought and barrenness. Nor is Áratos more complimentary: ὦ Λητοῖ, σὺ μενεῖς γε σιδηρεῖη φολεγάνδρῳ Δειλῇ, ἣ γύαρον παρελεύσεαι αὐτίχ' ὁμοίην; a passage cited by Strabo in his notice of Gýaros,|| and to which he had referred a little before, Φολέγανδρος, ἣν Ἄρατος σιδηρεῖην ὀνομάζει διὰ τὴν τραχύτητα. To mariners it remains to the present day one of the most inhospitable localities in the Archipelago, it being wholly unprovided with any harbour, or place of secure refuge for shipping.

There seems, therefore, to have been a general and well-grounded consent

* Vide Stéphan. Byz. ubi supra. Τὸ δὲ ἀμόργινος χιτῶν χρώματος ἴδιον. Etymol. Magn. Ἀμόργινος χιτωνίσκος παρὰ τὸ ἀμόργην, ὃ ἐστὶν εἶδος χρώματος ὁμοῖον βόσσω.

† Vide Geogr. Sacra, Lib. i. in Dict. Histor. p. 93. a.

‡ In M. S. Dalecamp.

§ See this epigram of Antípatros, cited at length in Holsten. ad Stéphan. pp. 347. a.

|| Lib. x. 5.

on the part of all writers who have mentioned Pholégandros as to its physical aspect and condition: consequently we may with safety select this as a basis in any inquiry relative to its étymon: not, however, to the neglect of its geographical position, as it may be said to form, in conjunction with Astypálaia, the side-columns of the vestibule of the Kykladic group to navigators coming from the south. I propose, moreover, for reasons already assigned, not to limit myself to Aramaïc themes, as BOCHART has done, but to interrogate also the Koptic, leaving it to the judgment of the reader versed in such inquiries to decide on which is most entitled to acceptance.

To commence with the former. I separate the name, as written by Strabo and Stéphanos, thus, Φολεγα-νδ'ρος, and find the divisions severally corresponding to the following Aramaïc compound, פלכא נדיר ראשא, wherein I suppose that the intermediate member had dropped its final letters during the process of its combination with the extremes so as to form a name. This I have marked by the apóstrophos in the Greek form. The result of the combination is פלכא נדראשא, which for brevity's sake would be subjected to a second apokopé, that is, of its Aramaïc final, and thus be reduced to a form very nearly identical with the Hellenic. The designation corresponds also with exactness to the picture of the island drawn by the Greeks themselves, as also to its position at the entrance to the Kykládes to a voyager from the south. That position is expressed by ראש or ראשא, and נדיר פלכא means "regio ista detestanda," or, in the more emphatic language of the poet, "illætabilis ora."*

The Hellenic name may, however, be resolved in another way, and differing from the former only by the retraction of the Rhô. This gives us Φολεγα-νδρ-ος, of which the Aramæan interpretation is פלכא נדר, "regio voti," or נדריא, "regio votorum." By these I understand the "vows," or "votive offerings," which were customary on the part of mariners in circumstances of distress or peril, and the danger of navigating the Sporadic sea in the vicinity of the iron-bound coast of our island to be thus appropriately expressed.

The reader will perceive that I have limited myself in proposing this choice of themes to words purely Aramaïc and of known authority: I therefore claim a preference in their favour to the étymon which BOCHART has offered,

* *Æneis*, III. 707.

פלך-גונדרי,* that is, as translated by him, "tractus lapidosus." There can be no doubt of this explanation of the origin of Φολέγανδρος possessing the advantages of being descriptive of its natural aspect, as well as of its exhibiting a very remarkable approximation in sound: but I demur to the recognising his concrete as being entitled to enter into a Phœnikian combination. There existed, it is true, an Aramæan root, גנר, whence the Chaldaïc form in Pâhel, גַּנְרָר, signifying "volvit," "devolvit," as is proved by a passage in the Targum of Onkelos,† יִנְגַּדְרוֹן יִתְּאֲבֵנָא מַעַל פִּימָא דְּבִירָא, and to this, perhaps, the appellation selected by BOCHART was subordinated: but it appears to have been a word of purely Rabbinical invention; and agreeably to this, the only authority which he has cited in its behalf is that of the Talmud of Jerusalem.‡

I proceed now to investigate the probability of this name being resolvable into Koptic, that is, Egyptian, elements, preparatory to which a few observations are requisite. The first is, that I hold myself at liberty to assume as my basis whichever of the varieties I have recounted above may appear to me most analogous to the language with which I deal at present: secondly, that as the sound of the Hellenic Déltā was unknown to the Egyptian alphabet, I may be permitted to assume that the Greeks would, when it suited their process of Hellenization, represent a Taû of that alphabet by their own Déltā;§ and thirdly, that they would not hesitate to promote the same end by metáthesis, elision, or any of the expedients conformable to their own grammatical rules, and this independently of the changes required for the affixing their own peculiar terminations.

Consistently with the first of these premises I assume the Ptolemæan name, Φιλόκανδρος, as my standard, and divide it thus, Φιλοκ-αν-δρος. A Koptic ori-

* Geogr. Sacr. I. cited in Dict. Histor., p. 790. a.

† Viz. of Genes. xxix. 8. The Targums of Jonathan Ben Uziel and Jerusalem employ the more classical יִנְגַּלְרוֹן.

‡ Vide בבא מציעא, fol. 80. 1. מַי אֵרַע מְחֻקָּת בְּגוֹנְדְרִי, cited by Buxtorf in his Lexic. Chald. Talm. Rabbin. p. 456. Ed. Basil. 1639.

§ A singular custom of the Koptic scribes may be mentioned in reference to this, which was, to replace the Tau with the Delta in certain Greek words which they introduced into their context: ex. gr. θέατρον, Ἀρτεμς, have been written by them in Acts, xix. 24. 29. 31. θεατρον, αρτεμς. See Peyron. Lexic. Coptic. p. 28. b.

ginal of the first at once presents itself in $\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\varrho$, which signifies "the end," "the summit," and was, by general consent, the theme of the name "Phílai," by which the Greeks denominated the sacred isle of Ísis on the confines of Upper Egypt.* Next to $\Phi\iota\lambda\omicron\kappa$ follows $\alpha\nu$, which I conceive to have represented the inseparable genitive prefix $\tilde{\alpha}$ or $\tilde{\iota}$. $\Delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ remains, the first letter of which I regard as a necessity resulting from the Hellenization of the original word, and, therefore, I write it $\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma$, consistently with the second of my postulates. My next step is, to select a term commencing with Tau, the signification of which may be correlative to that of $\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\varrho$, already stated, and also, in conjunction with this, fitted to express some known condition or characteristic of the island: for example, as $\sigma\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$. Pursuing this research, I find that $\tau\omega\rho\iota$ is such a word: its general signification is "instrumentum ferreum," whether edged or cusped, to the last of which meanings the term $\lambda\alpha\kappa\varrho$, in its sense "fastigium," is appropriate. I think it likely, however, that $\tau\omega\rho\iota$ in this connexion may have been susceptible of the abstract sense "ferrum," so that $\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\varrho\ \tilde{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho\iota$ may be correctly rendered "fastigium" (or "extremitas") "ferri," that is "ferreum," "ferrea:"† and if so, it would present a remarkable analogy to the $\sigma\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$ $\Phi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ of Áratos. It is evident also, that $\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\varrho$ may express either the geographical position of the island as the western boundary of the Sporádes, or its physical outline.

Still, it may be asked, how are we to account for a transformation apparently so strange as that of $\tau\omega\rho\iota$ into $\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$? My answer is, by the exigencies of the Hellenizing process, which demanded the elimination of the first vowel, and the replacement of the last with the general insular termination. The best reply, however, is the citation of a case in point, and the first which occurs to me is that of $\Sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$. We know that the Coptic form, whereof that was the Greek transmutation, was $\chi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\ddot{\iota}$,‡ that is, $\chi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\tau\iota$, and let us mark the successive changes effected in it: the first and third letters are replaced severally with a sibilant and a cognate labial: the syllable $\epsilon\nu$ is then introduced, but not ar-

* Vide Fascic. Inscript. III. pp. 401. a., 404. b., Ind. Coptic.

† Comp. Peyron. Gr. Copt. cap. IX. p. 41. "Nonne Hebræi dicunt שְׁהִיָּה , 'lingua sanctitatis' pro 'lingua sancta'? Ita Copti 'corona ferri, auri, æris,' pro 'ferrea, aurea, ærea.' lidem etiam scribunt $\text{O } \overline{\Pi}\rho\omicron\tau\beta$, 'esse auri,' pro 'aureum,' uti nos 'esser d'oro,' etc."

‡ Fascic. Inscript. III. Ind. Copt. p. 408. b.

bitrarily, for I regard it as the representative of the genitive prefix which the Hellenizer seems to have supplied. The fourth step was the elimination of the o, and the last, that of the Iauta to make room for the Hellenic final.

It only remains for me now to suggest two other themes which are susceptible of Hellenization by a more obvious, though not more analogical process, namely, *πυλακχ* ἢ τε *ρωοττ* and *πυλακχ* ἢ τε *πο*, the first signifying "extremitas sollicitudinis," or "ægrimonîæ;" the second, "extremitas portæ," or "aditus." *Πυλακχ* is here taken in the same sense which it bears as the étymon of *Phylai*, namely, its geographical. *Ρωοττ* expresses the emotion which the very aspect of *Pholégandros* seems to have excited, and *πο* its position in the adit to the *Kykládes*.

XI. *ΑΝΑΨΗ*. The origin of the name of this Sporade has been assigned by *Apollónios* to the interposition of *Phoibos* on behalf of the distressed *Argonaútai*. Their chief had addressed a prayer to the god,* the answer to which the poet records: *Τοῖσι δέ τις σποράδων βαιὴ ἀπὸ τόφρ' ἐφαάνθη Νῆσος ἰδεῖν, ὀλίγης ἱππουρῖδος ἀντί' α νήσου*,† subjoining afterwards that the mariners who had found shelter in it named it *Anáphe*... *Ἀνάφην δέ τε λισσάδα νήσον*‡ *Ἰσκον*, ὃ δὲ φοῖβός μιν ἀτυχομένοις ἀνέφηνε.‡

For this tradition of the Muse the merely philosophical writer§ has accounted by the ascent of *Anáphe* from the abyss during one of nature's paroxysms, never imagining that in the case before us, any more than he did in those of *Dêlos*, *Pátmos*, and *Rhódos*, the myth had been invented as an explanation of the presumed Hellenic étymon. *BOCHART* has entitled himself to our thanks for having been amongst the first to discard these anilities. In the case of *Anáphe*|| he has availed himself of the passage in *Apollónios*, in which he describes the grateful *Argonaútai* as dedicating an enclosed piece of ground (*τέμενος*) together with an altar, *ἄλσει ἐνὶ σκιερῷ*, to *Apóllon*, styled *Αἰγλήτης*,** to draw the conclusion that the *Phœnikians* had denominated the island from *פנפ*,

* Vide "Argonautiká." Δ'. 1701. ss.

† Ibid. 1711. s. Orph. 1754. ss. *Phótios*, Tmem. 168. *Stéphan*. Urb. pp. 128. s.

‡ Ubi supra, 1717. s.

§ Comp. *Plin.* ii. 89. 1. *Ammian.* R. G. xvii. 7. sub. fin. Vide supra, p. 218.

|| *Geogr. Sac.* i. 15. Cp. *Dict. Hist.* p. 100.

** Vide *Argonaut.* ubi supra, 1714. ss. *Strab.* Lib. x. 5. init. *Cónon ap. Phot.* xlix.

"leafy," or "overspread with foliage," implying thereby that such was its condition when they first became acquainted with it. If so, Anáphe must have presented a very different aspect from its present.

I prefer, however, the theme which rests on no such mythical basis. This island possesses a permanent and very remarkable feature, namely, the precipitous rock in its southern quarter, which has attracted the attention of such travellers as have landed on its shore. Hence it was that the marble was procured of which the temple of the Aiglétes was constructed, an act of idolatry which the Anaphiote of modern times has redressed by erecting on its summit a shrine dedicated to their Patron "lady of the reed," the Panaghía Kalamíne.

I therefore view the name in reference to this natural object, and class Anáphe amongst the islands of the Ægæan whose designations have preserved a memorial of their primitive connexion with Egypt. 'Ανάφη resolves itself at once into κῆ ἡλφε, or, as it was sometimes written, κῆ ἡλπη,* almost precisely as we have seen the Græco-Ægyptian Ἐθριβίς expressing κῆ ἡθρηβι.† Consequently, I would translate the former, "mansio cacuminis," or, "the island of the peak."

XII. Ρῥόδος. The testimonies of ancient writers are so consentient on the subject of Serpents having in early times infested this island in such numbers as to render it nearly uninhabitable, that I am inclined to regard BOCHART'S étymon of its name as amongst the most trust-worthy he has proposed.‡ It appears to me, however, to fail in one important respect, which is, that neither on its own showing, nor on that of its supposed Hellenic derivative, does it afford any explanation of the myth which obtained such credence amongst the Greeks, and has been briefly stated by Herakleídes in the following words: 'Ρόδον τὴν νῆσον τὸ παλαιὸν κεκρύφθαι λέγουσιν ὑπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης· ἀναφανῆναι δὲ ὕστερον ξηρανθεῖσαν.§ Such has not been the case with the names Δῆλος and Πάτμος, as has been abundantly proved;|| and to these we have added that of 'Ανάφη in the foregoing article.

* Basmurice: Peyron. Lexic. Copt. p. 10. a.

† Fascic. III. p. 399. Ind. Copt.

‡ Vide Geogr. Sac. Lib. I. 7. Col. 369. Supra. p. 205. not. (*).

§ Excerpt. de Politt. p. 455. Compare Píndar, Olymp. VII. 103. ss. cited below in the "General Postscript," viz. to page 202. line 11.

|| Vide Artt. VII. VIII. Comp. pp. 204. 217. s.

I now, therefore, propose the root פִּי, which satisfies this condition. Its meaning is "descendit," and its Heëmantic noun פִּיִּי signifies "a declivity," or "sloping ground." This gives us by the aphairesis of its Heëmantic letter, and metáthesis of the Vau, each allowable on principles of grammar,* פִּי, and this when Hellenized, 'Pódos, a name, therefore, which properly signifies, a territory descending, or sloping down. Now, this is precisely the appearance which Rhódos presents to the voyager steering towards it in the track of the ancient Phœnikian or Ægyptian trader, that is, in the direction of the port of Línos. The summit of the Madonna, the highest point of Artamiri,† the ancient Atábyris, rises in the centre, and from thence the land slopes down to the coast on either side with such regularity of outline as to form the two sides of a triangle, of which the base is a line running from north to south, and commencing with the town of Rhódos. This whole extent, when viewed at a sufficient distance, so strikes the beholder as to warrant a belief that it would suggest a name for the island in the Phœnikian times, in other words, that 'Pódos has been formed in the manner stated above, or from פִּיִּי, the Páhu of פִּי, in the sense "declivis." The signification, moreover, of פִּי itself would be suggestive of the myth of Píndaros‡ and Herakleídes, for Rhódos could not "descend" without being "immersed" in the abyss.

XIII. KRÉTE. Arguments of a very cogent nature have been adduced by the learned CALMET§ in support of his opinion, that the Caphtor mentioned in several texts of Scripture was identical with this island. If so, the Caphtorîm must have been a colony from Egypt, as it is expressly stated, that Mitsraïm was their immediate progenitor: "Mitsraïm begat Caphtorîm," || that is, the community** so denominated from the place of their settlement descended in a

* Vide Lee's Grammar, Lect. III. Art. 88. VIII. 178. 7.

† Or "Attamiri," an evident corruption of the ancient 'Ατάβυρις, Strab. XIV. 2. med. In some old editions of Diódoros 'Αταμύρου and 'Αταμυρίου appear instead of 'Αταβύρου and 'Αταβυρίου. Vide v. 59. Ed. Bip.: and Stéphanos has 'Αταβύρια ὄρη, Urb. p. 480.

‡ See above, p. 218.

§ Vide "Dictionary, etc.," vol. I. Art. Caphtor.

|| Genesis, x. 14.

** That the name Caphtorîm is to be received in this sense is certain from its position: for those which it accompanies were doubtless the Ethnics of the several families, amongst which Egypt, the

direct line from this son of Kham. Such being the announcement, it may prove interesting to inquire whether the testimony of Language harmonize with that of the Sacred Record.

If we are to allow any weight to Etymology as a witness, we must conclude that the Koptitai of Upper Egypt were amongst the foremost in passing the boundaries of their territory, and seeking intercourse with foreigners, for nothing is more certain than that the name *Αἰγυπτος* was that by which the Biblical Mitsraim was known to the Greeks from the earliest period of their history, that is, a direct Hellenization of the Koptic *ⲙⲏⲕⲉⲡⲧⲟ*, *ⲙⲏⲕⲉⲡⲧ*, "Home" (or "Land") "of Koptós."* We can hardly, therefore, be regarded as straining the point of etymology overmuch, when we trace in the Shemitic *כְּפִתּוֹר* a memorial of the same Koptós, either in its Thebaïc form *כֶּפְטָו*, or its Memphite *כֶּפְט* which the Arab writers have retained in their *كفت*. We find, moreover, a Koptic term signifying Rest, Repose, *ⲱⲡⲉ*, and thus analogous to *οἶα*, *οἶα* (the Greek *οἶα*), a Habitation, a Place of Rest. Let us now combine these elements in the name *כֶּפְטָוⲱⲡⲉ*, and we exhibit, as nearly as the Hebrew combinations permit, the Biblical *כְּפִתּוֹר*.

Such I conceive to have been, if not the Protonyme of this island, at least entitled to rank as an aboriginal designation. But the question here arises: How are we to account for the supplantation of this name by that with which the present article has been headed? The answer to this will, if I mistake not, satisfactorily prove the intruder to have been of Shemitic descent.

We may, perhaps, conclude, without any undue pressure upon the sacred text, from the longevity of the Patriarchs, and the rapidity with which the peopling the earth advanced during the Patriarchal times, that the migration from Upper Egypt hinted above took place in the persons of one sole branch of Mitsraim's family, and during his lifetime. Let us now attend to what we learn

territory of Mitsraim, was partitioned. The designation *Pathrusim*, for example, points instantly to that section of the Thebaïs which the Egyptians termed *Παθρῶν*, or *Πατριοῦς*, and the Hebrew writers *פְּתֻרִים*. Vide Ezek. xxix. 14. Fascic. Inscr. III. pp. 182. 404. 406. The *Casluhim* also, mentioned as the progenitors of the Philistim, have been placed by JONATHAN BEN UZIEL in the Pentápolis, that is, the Kyrenaïc territory, and by the Jerusalem Targum in that of Pentáschoinos, between Pelusium and Mount Casius. The former I think the more probable.

* Vide Fascic. Inscriptt. III. Ind. Copt. p. 402. a. supra, p. 259.

from the same source respecting the Philistim, namely, that they were his descendants in the generation succeeding that of the Caphtorim.* If, now, we connect with this what the prophet Amos† states with regard to them, namely, that they came out of Caphtor, the conclusion follows, that they abandoned the territory of the Casluhim, and joined their kinsmen, who had colonized Caphtor in the second generation, during that which immediately followed it. Hence we find them styled by the prophet Jeremiah, "the residue of the isle of Caphtor," *שארית אי כפתור*.‡

When we next read of them, they are settled in Palestine : *והעיים הישבים* ; *בְּחִצְרִים עַד עֵזָה כַּפְתֹּרִים הִצְאִים מִכַּפְתֹּר הַשְּׂמִידִם וַיֵּשְׁבוּ תַּחְתָּם* ;§ the 'Avim mentioned here having been descended from a son of Canaan.|| In this, their new settlement, they appear to have been known by the ethnic *כרתים*, as is proved by such expressions as *נִגַּב הַכְּרִיתִי*, *וְהַכְּרִיתִי*, *עַל-הַכְּרִיתִי*, etc., in the historical books of the Old Testament,** combined with two from the prophets Ezekiel and Zephaniah, to be cited shortly.

The meaning of this term, as an appellative, seems to have corresponded to the Latin "alienigenæ;" and it may be suspected that David's expression to Ittai, who, together with the rest of the Gittites, had resolved to share his fortunes on the occasion of Absalom's unnatural rebellion, admits of a reference to this sense, at least remotely, and in accordance with the well-known position of the Philistim in the country; for there appears to have been a considerable degree of emphasis in his words when he advised his follower to withdraw; "For thou art a stranger!" *כִּי נֹכְרִי אַתָּה* ,†† and this, not only as a member of my body-guard, but also as an allophyle, *כרתִי*. The texts from Zephaniah and Ezekiel referred to above, taken in connexion with the versions of them in the Septuagint, will be found strongly confirmative of this view.

I pass, in the mean time, to the notice of another signification attached to this ethnic . . . one, however, not involved in its proper and etymological sense,

* CALMET's oversight in his statement respecting this succession (vol. I. art. Caphtorim), is at once corrected by a reference to the original, *וְאֵת כַּפְתֹּרִים*, which is rightly translated in our authorized version.

† Ch. ix. 7.

‡ XLVII. 4.

§ Deuteronomy, II. 23.

|| Genesis, x. 17.

** Viz. Samuel, I. 30. 14., II. 8. 18., Kings, I. 1. 38., Chron. I. 18. 17.

†† Samuel, II. 15. 19.

but assigned to it in consequence of the peculiar military accomplishment of the Philistim . . . which is, "sagittarii," men skilled in archery. Thus we find כרתים represented more than once in the Targums by קשתיא,* and correspondently in the Syriac by ܟܪܬܝܐ.† This, as I may incidentally remark, corroborates the identification of Caphtor which has been given in the commencement of the present article, so far as it extends; but I would not proceed the length of supposing with BOCHART,‡ that the ethnic כרתים had been applied by the Phœnikians to the people of Kréte, in consequence of their rivalling the Palæstinian Krethim in their use of the bow. I conceive that the reason of this application lay deeper, that is, in the cognizance, which the Phœnikians cannot but have possessed, of the true origin of the latter, and that nothing was more natural than that they should extend to the parent country a designation with which they were so familiar at home. It unquestionably arose from some such persuasion as this, in other words, a belief in the identity of Kréte with the Biblical Kaphtor, that the Greek Interpreters have translated the two passages in Ezekiel and Zephaniah, to which I have already referred, in the following manner: § LXX. *Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐκτείνω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀλλοφύλους, καὶ ἐξολοθρεύσω τοὺς Κρήτας.* ¶ LXX. *Ὁὐαὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὸ σχοίνισμα τῆς θαλάσσης, πάροιχοι Κρητῶν, λόγος Κυρίου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς Χαναάν, γῆ Ἀλλοφύλων.* This text is immediately followed by the words; ** LXX. *Καὶ ἔσται Κρήτη νομὴ ποιμνίων.*

It is evident from the construction of parallels, that the Ἀλλόφυλοι and the Κρήτες here mentioned were one and the same people, the name of whose territory was Κρήτη.†† The first of these versions is sufficiently warranted and explained by the texts already cited from Deuteronomy and the prophets

* Vide Samuel, II. 8. 18. Kings, I. 1. 38. † Vide Kings, I. 1. 38. Chron. I. 18. 17.

‡ Geogr. Sacra, I. 15. med. Cp. Dict. Histor. p. 370. a.

§ Ezek. XXV. 16.

¶ Zephani. II. 5.

** Ibid. v. 6.

†† Schleusner explains this, "Regio Palæstinæ orientalis: כְּרִית, fossuræ." Lexic. V. T. II. p. 316. h. It is quite clear, however, that Κρήτη in the last of the above texts of Zephaniah answers to the words חֵם, viz., the line of coast occupied by the Philistines, in the first rendered τὸ σχοίνισμα τῆς θαλάσσης: as also, that כְּרִית and כְּרִיתִים belonged to quite different roots, the former to כָּרַח, and the latter to כָּרַת.

Jeremiah and Amos, respecting the settlement of the Philistim in Palestine; and it may not, perhaps, be reckoned as overstraining the testimony of etymology beyond its legitimate bounds, to suppose that the ethnic כרתים had been assigned to them as a memorial of their allophyllous origin, in other words, of their having been immigrants into that country, this having been necessarily preceded by their "severing" their connexion with their original territory, and followed by their "exterminating" the 'Avim. Now, both these meanings are evidently germane to the root-signification of כרתים, which is subordinated to כרת, "to cut off," or "away." Again: how are we to account for the Greek Translators having selected Κρήτες as the ethnic in their language best answering to כרתים, and Κρήτη as a version of חבל הים, the line (σχοίνισμα) of coast occupied by them in Palestine? All are familiar with these designations, and know that they belonged to the Ægean island: and it appears to me inexplicable, that they should have adopted them here in preference to Χερεθαῖοι and Χερέθ (or γῆ Χερεθαίων), as they before used Χερταῖοι, Ἰεβουσαῖοι, and the like, had it not been that they regarded that island as the point of departure of the Philistim for their new settlement in the territory of which they afterwards originated the name.*

* The primitive seat of this remarkable people I place with their progenitors, the Casluhîm, in the Pentápolis of the African coast, the distance of which from the Kriumétopon of Kréte did not exceed a thousand stadia, or about two days' sail (Strabo, xvii. 3., Plin. iv. 20. 4.). The shortness of this interval would naturally induce emigration on the part of the Philistim, who would join their kinsmen, the colonists from Upper Egypt, for supposing whom to have been already settled in the island I have stated my reasons. These tribes I regard as having constituted the aboriginal population mentioned by Heródotos: γῆν γὰρ Κρήτην εἶχον τὸ παλαιὸν πᾶσαν Βάρβαροι, that is, peoples distinct from the Hellenic race (i. 173. init.).

The Philistim appear, in process of time, to have been "brought out of Caphtor," that is, to have been dissociated from the Caphtorîm, and conducted to the territory occupied by the Canaanite 'Avim. During these changes of locality, however, it is natural to suppose that they would retain their inherited superstitions, institutions, and arms, in all which, so far as we possess the means of comparison, we trace a marked resemblance to those of the inhabitants of Kréte. For example; an analogy has been perceived between the Idæan Zeús, to the nurture of whose infancy Bees were fabled to have contributed so largely of their stores (Diódor. v. 70.), and the idol of the Ekronites, בעל זכרב; and both may have had a common origin, namely, the use of the Bee as a territorial symbol by the ancient Egyptians. It is possible, however, that the latter may have meant the same thing with the Zeús Ἀπόμυιος of the Eleians mentioned by Pausanías (v. 14.). But we

XIV. ΚΥΠΡΟΣ. Heródotos writes as follows respecting the colonization of this island: Τοντέων (that is, Κυπρίων) δὲ τοσάδε ἔθνεά ἐστι· οἱ μὲν, ἀπὸ Σαλαμῖνος καὶ Ἀθηνέων· οἱ δὲ, ἀπὸ Ἀρκαδίας· οἱ δὲ, ἀπὸ Κύθνου· οἱ δὲ, ἀπὸ Φοινίκης· οἱ δὲ,

can hardly be mistaken in the following: the expertness of the Philistim in the use of the bow, which, as we have seen, caused their name of כְּרִיתִים to be synonymous with the Rabbinical מִשְׁרֵק, reminds the classical reader of the weapon of Górtyna, Knosós, Áptera, and Kydonía (Pausan. i. 29., iv. 8. 20.); and both are connected in the memory of the Egyptian archæologist with that potent arm of the military service which contributed so essentially to the victorious progress of the conquerors amongst the Pharaohs. (Wilkinson, vol. i. pp. 304. ss.)

Let us now direct our attention to the Kretan institutions; for these, as detailed by Pláton, who has commenced with them in his great work "of Laws" (p. 624., etc.), also by Aristotéles (De Republ. ii. 10.), and Strabo (x. 4.), furnish the most conclusive argument on behalf of the Egyptian colonization of this island, so congenial do we find them to the spirit of that people, and so evidently did they originate from some dominant mind, which had received its training in the Egyptian school of polity; or rather, perhaps, from a series of such minds recorded in mythical lore under the appellations of Dáktyloi, Priests of the Kretan Ísis, and Kurêtes, whose successive efforts to civilize and refine resulted in that system which a fabulous antiquity has attributed to Mínos. It is related of this legislator, that he retired for nine years to the cave of his sire Zeús, in a spirit emulative of the fame of Rhadámantys, and at the expiration of that period returned with a Digest of ordinances, which he enforced on the ground of his having received them from the god himself (Odys. τ'. 178. s.; Pláton, Mínos, p. 319. b.; Strab. ubi supra). What proof could we have more evident than this, that the Lawgiver of Kréte was, like the Heraklès of antiquity, a combination in one person of many individuals, or perhaps more truly, the Impersonation of that divine principle of Justice and Truth, which the courts of judicature in ancient Egypt presented under a twofold emblem (Wilkinson, vol. ii. p. 27.), and the Hellenic mythist could only make clear by embodying it in an individual.

His fabled predecessor Rhadámantys had also claimed a divine origin for the laws which he introduced into his rude community, and he also had his reward: for as Mínos, the Impersonation of the 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤏 𐤏𐤍𐤕𐤏𐤕, the principle of "Divine Truth," received after death honours approaching to divine, so was Rhadámantys associated with him, though in an inferior grade, as 𐤏𐤍𐤕𐤏𐤕 𐤁𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤍𐤕𐤏𐤕, "Judge of Hádes." Even Aiakós, the myth-created Hero of the Æginetans, whom in one sense we may regard as purely of Greek invention, may be referred thematically to an Egyptian origin, as "Mansion of the Dead," or "Increment of the Grave," 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍𐤕𐤏𐤕, or 𐤁𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤍𐤕𐤏𐤕; and if so, we possess a remarkable analogy to the Egyptian triad of Ósiris, Hóros, and Ánubis. (Plútarch. De Isid. etc. xxviii.; Wilkinson, vol. iv. pp. 363. 401. 441. s.).

The very general consent of the ancient Paraphrasts and Translators in identifying Kaphtor with Kappadokia seems to have originated in nothing more convincing than the similarity in sound between כַּפְתָּר and Καππαδο. Are we then to lay no stress on the approximation of Aptéras, one of the names in the list of Kretan monarchs (Euséb. Chron. p. 77.) to כַּפְתָּרִי, or of the Kretan

ἀπὸ Αἰθιοπίας· ὡς αὐτοὶ Κύπριοι λέγουσι*. Stéphanos† informs us as to the origin of its name, according to the opinions which were current amongst the Greeks, deriving it ἀπὸ Κύπρου τῆς θυγατρὸς Κινύρου, ἢ ἀπὸ φανομένου ἄνθους κύπρου. Ἀστύνομος δέ φησι, Κρύπτον κεκληθῆσθαι διὰ τὸ κρύπτεσθαι πολλάκις ὑπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης· εἶτα Κύπρος. He then proceeds to recount the names by which it had been known at successive periods: ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Κεραστὶς, ἀπὸ τοῦ πολλὰ ἄκρα ἔχειν· καὶ Κεραστίας, καὶ Ἀμαθουσία, καὶ Μηϊονίς, καὶ Σφήκεια, καὶ Ἀκαμαντίς. From these authorities we derive some valuable hints on the subject of the ethnology of Κύπρος, certain of which I now proceed to investigate.

There can be no question but that the Æthiopians and the Phœnikians were the most ancient colonizers of this island, the former of whom inhabited the division of Egypt which lay between the Nile and the Arabian gulf, and was included, during the Makedonian and Roman periods, in the jurisdiction of the Thebάρχης, or Governor of the Thebaïs,‡ a territory then extending to the southern limits of the present Sennaar.

It follows, therefore, that in any attempt to settle the etymology of the Kyprian names, we should allow the Egyptian element its due share of consideration. Let us, then, examine to what extent it is possible to bring this, firstly, in the case of the island itself, into harmony with two of the themes which have been noticed in the first of the passages cited above from Stéphanos.

I commence with the shrub Κύπρος§ (ἄνθος κύπρου), in the Arabic الخسنة, the "Lawsonia inermis" of the Linnæan system. It appears also to have been the plant understood in Scripture by the name כפר or כופר,|| which, accordingly, BOCHART** has selected, and added to his list of evidences of the preva-

city Ἄπτερα (Stéphan. p. 150.) to כפרתר; or lastly, on Μινώα, also the name of a Kretan town, having been the ancient designation of קרית, the chief stronghold of the Palæstinian Krethîm? (Stéphan. pp. 256. 562.).

* VII. 90. fin.

† De Urb. pp. 492. a. Comp. Konstantîn. Porphyrogénnet. De Themat. i. Th. 15.

‡ Comp. Fascic. III. p. 177. n. CCCLVII. a.

§ Vide Plin. XII. 51. fin. "Optimum habetur ex Canopica in ripis Nili nata: Secundum Ascalone Judææ: Tertium Cypro insula, odoris suavitate." Hence the line in the Hymn to Aphrodite, v. 66. Σεύατ' ἐπὶ τροίην, προλιποῦσ' εὐώδεα κύπρον.

|| Vide "Canticles," I. 14., IV. 13.

** Geogr. Sac. I. in Dict. Hist. Steph. p. 383. a.

lence of the Phœnikian element in the Hellenic proper names. It happens, however, that the Koptic term for the shrub is also $\kappa\omicron\tau\pi\epsilon\rho$, and to which, each being so exactly the counterpart of the other, the palm of antiquity is to be adjudged, who can decide? If the latter have been formed from the Greek, as the learned PEYRON* appears to intimate, how are we to account for its identity with the Hebrew designation, unless we are to suppose that in copying a name from one language its framers adopted the standard of another? To this may be added the difficulty of assuming that the Egyptians possessed no independent term in their primeval language for a plant so well known to them† and appreciated from the remotest times.

I now pass to the next theme mentioned by Stéphanos, that is, $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\rho\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, the very statement of which leads to the conclusion that it had been warranted by the presence of a Taû in the earlier Hellenic name; in effect, that it was written Κρύπτος , as the authority cited by Stéphanos informs us. We will suppose now what is by no means improbable, that this Κρύπτος had been the result of a Hellenizing process, the object of which was to appropriate the name of the island to a Hellenic theme, and that this consisted in removing the Rhô from its proper and original place; for it is certain that $\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\pi\omicron$ (that is, $\pi\alpha\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\ \pi\upsilon\omicron$) supplies a geographical designation accurately descriptive of the position of Kýpros with respect to Egypt, as Po means "porta," "janua;" also, "caput." This would become $\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\pi\omicron$, or $\kappa\alpha\pi\tau\pi\omicron$, from which the Hellenic $\kappa\rho\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$ would arise, and by eliminating the Taû, $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma$.

This view of the étymon of Κύπρος possesses the advantage of establishing a remarkable analogy between it and Kaphtor (כפתור , $\pi\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau\tau\ \pi\upsilon\omega\rho\epsilon\varsigma$, or $\pi\upsilon\omicron\rho\epsilon\varsigma$),‡ so that it might appear that the colonization of both these islands by

* Vide Lexic. Copt. p. 69. a. In p. 271. a. $\chi\omicron\tau\pi\epsilon\rho$ is stated from KIRCHER to have been the Koptic term for the fruit produced by this plant.

† Compare the testimony of Plinius cited above, who assigns the first rank in excellence amongst the different growths of this shrub to that of Kánobos. Note (§), p. 278.

‡ I have here, as in other places, given the components of the name in full: but it is manifest that during the process of effecting their combinations, inorganic adjuncts, such as Articles and Prefixes (sometimes even an organic letter, as here $\epsilon\varsigma$, see p. 273.), would be eliminated either in whole or in part, according as it suited the requirements of the language into which the composite

adventurers from Upper Egypt had been simultaneous. If so, the Biblical Caphtorim would either be identical with or included under the ethnic of Heródotos, *Αιθίοπες*.

I now proceed to consider certain other geographical names connected with the island before us, of which, as I wish to shorten these remarks, I shall select two of the most ancient, Páphos and Amathûs; occurring also in quarters most likely to be visited by mariners from the south. The Páphos to which I here refer is the old city (*Παλαίπαφος*), termed so to distinguish it from the new (*Νεάπαφος*), which was situated on the coast to the west of the former, and distant sixty stadia.* The circumstances of their positions were very different: the new Páphos lay on a creek near the shore, little above the sea-level, whereas the old town had been built on an eminence ten stadia removed from it: hence the description by Strabo, *ὑπὲρ τῆς θαλάττης ἰδρυμένη*, and the epithet "celsa" applied to it by Virgil.† It seems, therefore, by no means improbable, that Egyptian founders of the city would designate it by a name expressive of its local position, this appearing sufficiently remarkable to attract notice. They would accordingly style it *φαιοταφε* or *φαιοφε*, namely, as "appertaining to," that is, "founded upon, an eminence," or, with the Thebaïc possessive-form, *παιοφε*,‡ the transition of which to *Πάφος* would be immediate.

Should it be objected here, that I am now extending the meaning of the possessive prefix beyond its due bounds, notwithstanding the occurrence of such expressions as *ἱεοκ φαιογ* *ἱεογ*,§ in accordance with which *πατανε*, or by a fusion of separate dialects, *παταφε*, *παιοφε*, may be legitimately rendered *ὁ τοῦ ὕψους*, some such term as *παιογ* being subauded to authorize the use of the masculine prefix . . . should this, I repeat, be objected to, I am prepared to offer an alternative, which appears moreover to be recommended to our acceptance by a rather singular coincidence.

The geographer Stéphanos informs us, under his heading 'ΕΡΥΘΡΑ' that,

was to be introduced. Thus, in the present case, both the possessive and the definite articles are supposed to have been excluded in the reduction of the simples to the Onomastic *כפרור*.

* Strabo, xiv. 6. in Cypro.

† *Æneis*, x. 51.

‡ My meaning here is, that for the sake of euphony, the first Phi in the Memphitic form *φαιοφε* would be converted into Pi in the transition to *Πάφος*, i. e., the Thebaïc prefix-form adopted.

§ Vide Peyron, *Lexic. Copt.* p. 163. b. Gr. cap. v. § 3.

ἔστι καὶ Κύπρου ἄλλη (that is, another Erythrā), ἡ νῦν Πάφος,* he meaning thereby ἡ νέα Πάφος: but the distinction here is of little moment, as we are only discussing the subject of names. The question immediately suggests itself, Whence arose the succession of Páphos to Erythrā as a designation of the same town? I am disposed to think, that the answer to this lies deeper than has been imagined by the ordinary Hellenic etymologist. Referring to what I have already stated with respect to the Αἰθίοπες who, according to the Kyprian tradition, had contributed their share to the early colonization of this island, I have now merely to remind my readers, that the boundary of that people's country on its eastern side, the Ἐρυθρὰ Θάλαττα of the Greeks, was denominated in their language Φιοεε ἡγῶρι.† I assume it, moreover, as highly probable, because natural, that these aboriginal settlers would feel anxious to preserve some memorial of their native land, and consequently, that the designation οὔρωεε παφιοεε, in the case of the immigrant, and πιεεεἡγῶπι παφιοεε, in that of the settlement, would be those by which each respectively would be known. We will now suppose these to be Hellenized, and is it not manifest that ἄποικος πάφιος would represent the first; τὸ κτίσμα πάφιον, the second; and that, the Ethnic once formed, the transition to the name, Πάφος, would follow as a matter of course?

It remains, however, that we should account for the name Ἐρυθρά, which, we are told, was the prior designation; and this presents no great difficulty. I am persuaded, that it resulted from a desire of a more complete Hellenization than was obtained by merely modifying the Egyptian name; that the Greek, therefore, instead of Φιοεε ἡγῶρι, selected his own vernacular translation of it, Ἡ Ἐρυθρὰ Θάλαττα,‡ the first member of which he chose as the representative of πιεεεἡγῶπι (or πιονε) παφιοεε, and then formed its regular ethnic Ἐρυθραιῶς, equivalent to οὔρωεε παφιοεε as given above. Antiquity, however, in process of time re-asserted its rights, for the name Páphos, which contains the elements of the true Egyptian, is as old as the days of Homer,§ and is traceable even in the barbaric form of its modern representative, while Erythrā is known only to the page of the geographer.

* De Urb. p. 354.

† Vide Fascic. Inscript. III. Ind. Copt. p. 407. b.

‡ Ibid. p. 177. n. ccclvii. a. 8. s.

§ Odyss. 9. 363. Hymn. Γ'. 59.

I proceed now to offer some remarks on the name Amathûs. It is so well known that the worship of Aphrodite in this city and its territory dated from the earliest antiquity, that it becomes unnecessary for me to incumber my page with many citations in proof of it. I content myself, therefore, with transcribing one from Pausanias: "Ἔστι δὲ Ἀμαθοῦς ἐν Κύπρῳ πόλις Ἀδωνίδος ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ Ἀφροδίτης ἱερόν ἐστιν ἀρχαιότατον.*"

I esteem it as highly probable, that this cult of the citizens of Amathûs had descended to them from the Thebaïc colonists, whom we may reasonably suppose to have introduced into their new settlement the rites of Athór (Ἀθωρ) along with those of the worship of Ósirís (Ὀσίρις), to whose consort and sister Ísis (Ἥσε) she bore so close a resemblance;† as she is known to have been the Tutelary deity of the western, or Libyan, district of the Thebaïs, extending as far as Hermonthís,‡ as also to have been a Contemplar in each of the triads worshipped at Téntyra,§ Apollinópolis Magna, Ómbos, and Abunkís. It follows as a consequence from this, that they would in all likelihood denominate it from that goddess of their mythology, "The Possession of Athór," Πισσεεργί (or Πισσεεργτε) ἠἈθωρ, expressed onomastically ΠισσεεργἈθωρ or Πισσεεργ. The Phœnikian representative of this would be אמתרוס, if we may conclude from the analogy of פתרוס, which occurs in several texts of Scripture|| as the Hebrew equivalent of ΠἈθωρ, the district of the Thebaïs above mentioned, or the Hermonthite nome; and the transition from thence to the Hellenic Ἀμαθοῦς would only imply the exclusion of its fourth letter, for the sake of euphony.

Again: the supposition which I have ventured accounts not only for the name Amathûs, but also for the Cult of which the district was the chosen seat during the Hellenic ascendancy; for the Greeks always reckoned their Aphrodite as identical with the Egyptian Athór. Many proofs of this could be pro-

* Lib. ix. 41. 2. Comp. Stéphan. pp. 112. s. Ovid. Am. iii. 15. 15. Catull. xxvi. 14. lxxviii. 51.

† Compare Wilkinson, vol. iv. pp. 381. s., 386. s. Plútarch. de Iside, etc., lvi. A similar approximation of the Kyprian Aphrodite to Deméter has been noticed and illustrated by CLARKE: Travels, vol. ii. p. 317. 4to. Ed.

‡ Viz. the district ΠἈθωρι. See p. 272. note (**).

§ Vide Wilkinson, ubi supra, pp. 231. 389. ss.

|| Isaiah, xl. 11. Jerem. xlv. 1. 15. Ezekiel, xxix. 14., xxx. 14.

duced; but I content myself with referring to one in which I may be regarded as personally interested;* I mean the inscription in front of the *Prónaos* of the temple at Denderah. This fane had been dedicated to a triad of deities, amongst whom, as appears by its existing sculptures, *Athór* was the most eminent in rank (*ἡ κυριωτάτη*†), and therefore gave it its name; a circumstance which the dedicatory *titulus* expresses, **ΑΦΡ[ΟΔΕ]ΙΤΗΙ . ΘΕΑΙ . ΜΕΓΙΣΤΗΙ . ΚΑΙ . ΤΟΙΣ . ΓΥΝΝΑΟΙΣ . ΘΕΟΙΣ**, in exact accordance with the testimony of *Strabo*.‡

This view of the origin of the Hellenic cult serves, moreover, to throw light on the expressions of *Stéphanos* under the head **ΑΜΑΘΟΥΣ**: *Ἀμαθοῦς πόλις Κύπρου ἀρχαιοτάτη, ἐν ᾗ Ἄδωνις Ὅσιρις ἐτιμᾶτο, ὃν, Αἰγύπτιον ὄντα, Κύπριοι καὶ Φοίνικες ἰδιοποιοῦνται*.§ To understand this, it is necessary to premise that the attributes of *Ísis* and *Athór* so resembled each other in many respects, that the Greeks fell into the error of confounding them, although in reality quite distinct members of the Egyptian *Pántheon*: hence such expositions as the following: *Ἡ δ' Ἰσις ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ Μοῦθ, || καὶ πάλιν Ἀθυρί** καὶ Μεθύερ†† προσ-αγορεύεται*. This entitles us, therefore, to suppose that the rites which the Egyptian immigrants had really introduced were those of *Ísis*, and that the Greeks, in process of time, substituted for these solemnities the worship of *Aphrodíte*. It would follow as a matter of course, from their intimate connexion, that the former would be accompanied by her consort *Ósir*is, and thus a way would be prepared for that appropriation of the Egyptian cult to which *Stéphanos* bears his testimony. I am inclined, moreover, to think that the

* Vide Fascic. Inscript. III. p. 216. n. CCCLXV. b.

† Vide Fascic. Inscr. III. p. 172. note (e).

‡ Lib. XVII. 1. Τιμῶσι δὲ Ἀφροδίτην κ. τ. λ. viz. the Tentyrites.

§ De Urb. p. 112.

|| *Plútarch. De Iside, etc. LVI. fin. Comp. Wilkinson, IV. pp. 382. 384.* This eponyme was most probably a contraction of **ΜΗΤΕΡ ΠΟΤΩΤ**, “Mother of the Earth’s fruits,” analogous to *Δημήτηρ*. See p. 282. note (†), *supra*.

** Otherwise *Ἀθύρ*, (Fascic. Inscr. III. p. 242. n. CCCLXXIV. i. 8. p. 406. a. Ind. Copt.) = **Δεωρ**, contracted from **ΗΙ ΠΤΕ ΔΩΡ**, *οἶκος Ὀρου* in *Plútarch. ubi supra*. Vide Fascic. Inscr. III. p. 217. not. (z).

†† Viz. **ΔΕΩΡ** (*Ἀθυρί*) *ερ*, expressive of the Act of Replenishing *Athýr*, or, as *Plútarchos* intimates, *Τὸ τρίτον σύνθετόν ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ πλήρους καὶ τοῦ αἰτίου*. *Ubi supra*.

expression Ἄδωνις Ὀσίρις means nothing more than Ἀδωνόσις,* which the Phœnikians would very probably write אֲדוֹן אֲרִי, agreeably to the Egyptian Ⲫϥ ⲟϣϣⲓ, where Ⲫϥ, that is, Ⲫⲟⲓϥ or Ⲫⲟⲓϥ, signifies Lord, than which title of Ὀσίρις none is more frequent on the monuments of Egypt.†

If now we revert to the list of names of Kýpros which has been given above from Stéphanos, we may possibly obtain some glimpse of an étymon of Amathûs, which may have been in popular acceptance amongst the Hellenic races, with whom the advent of the descendants of Kûsh and Mitsraîm had become a legend enveloped in the darkest haze of antiquity. We may reasonably suppose that the latter would bring over with them, amongst other memorials of their country, those ideographical delineations with which the learned have become so familiar, and with none more than the types of the insect genera. I select for the present occasion one of these, the Bee with expanded wings, which Hieroglyphists consider to have been a territorial symbol.‡ I suppose, moreover, that the Greeks of whom I now speak had received it as designative, either individually or collectively, of their Egyptian predecessors, under the form of another Hymenópteros, for which the hieroglyphical representation of the Bee might, at least popularly, be taken, namely, the Wasp. It would immediately result from this misconception, that the Individual, the Community to which he belonged, and the Territory which it occupied, would severally receive the names Σφήξ, Σφήκες, and Σφήκεια. An inquiring Greek would then apply his ingenuity in tracing etymologies, for which his countrymen were at all times so remarkable, and elicit from Ἀμαθούς a corroboration of this belief; for its Egyptian components would at once be concluded to have been ~~Ⲫⲟⲓϥ~~, signifying "Vespæ," and Ⲫⲟⲓϥ, "Congregatio," "Multitudo," these being elements into which it would appear "prima facie" to resolve itself.

I feel persuaded that it was by some such process as this, that the Kyprian Greeks arrived at the *geographical truth* enunciated by the Scholiast on Lykóphron: § Ἡ Κύπρος πρότερον Σφήκεια ἐκαλεῖτο ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνοικησάντων ἐκεῖσε ἀνδρῶν, οἱ ἐκαλοῦντο Σφήκες. This is not the only instance on record of a specious etymology conducting to an imaginary conclusion.

* Vide Berkel. in Stéphan. p. 112. not. 30.

† Wilkinson, vol. iv. p. 320. Comp. Art. v. supra, pp. 253. a.

‡ Vide Sharpe's "Rudiments of a Vocabulary of Egyptian Hieroglyphics," Nos. 417. 421.

§ V. 447. Οἱ πέντε που Σφήκειαν εἰς Κερυστίδα.

POSTSCRIPT.

Page 236, heading, "SECTION V."—I had intended at first to denominate this Section "Supplementary," but on reflection substituted the above form, in order to preserve the continuity of the numbering, as well as to mark the connexion of its subject-matter with the etymological theory developed in part in the Section which goes before.* I say "in part," because the discussion of the Koptic themes, which forms so conspicuous a feature in this one, has not received any attention in the Fourth for a reason which may as well be candidly owned . . . my unconsciousness of their applicability co-ordinately with the better known and more generally recognised Phœnikian. My admission of the new element has been, in effect, of a comparatively recent date, and in some degree fortuitous, it having resulted from the course of my Koptic studies undertaken for a wholly different purpose, namely, the determination of *étyma* exclusively Egyptian.

Page 241, line 15.—**האי עברא**. This means literally "the region beyond," and the Greek synonymes annexed have been so arranged as to represent the analogy of each to its corresponding Shemitic word, that is, of *γη* (*aîa Faia? gaîa*) to **אי**, Aram. **אא**, and of *πέρας* to **עברא**, with *aphaîresis* of the *υ*. That the emphatic form **האי** is admissible here is clear from **האין** in a passage of Ezekiel.† It might, however, be written as above, **אא**, in stricter conformity to the Aramaïc usage: and so also in page 251, line 8, where **האי אבסין** may be otherwise written **אא אבסין**.

Page 242, line 17.—BOCHART has not given the Arabic form here, and, therefore, when composing this note, I wrote **نلف**?, as doubting its correctness in the present case. I have since found my suspicion to be well founded, and that very probably **جلف**, signifying "olla," was the term which he intended to represent by **נלפ**.

Page 243, line 2.—**עלין עבא**. This is BOCHART's *étymon*, which the reader will please to alter to **עלי עבא**, "exsultabundus (that is 'lætus') sinus."

Page 248, note (§).—BOCHART has treated of this *étymon* in a manner which

* *Supra*, pp. 203–205. 216–218.

† Ch. xxvi. v. 18.

has exposed him to the disingenuous criticism of the author of the article LÉSBOS in the "Ancient Universal History,"* who keeps wholly out of sight the use which he has made of the inseparable prefix, and represents him as deducing the name from "Esbuith."† This *ex parte* statement would have been obviated by a little less complexity in his details: for all that is requisite in such cases as these is to obtain thematic forms which comprise the consonantal equivalents of the Hellenic names. The result of laying too much stress on a presumed identity in vocalization would, in many instances, be found embarrassing, and in all useless, as this would be regulated during the Hellenizing process by its own special laws. In this point of view BOCHART derived no manner of advantage from his form לְהַשְׁבוּעַ, as the case-affix of the Hellenic name would be determined by considerations wholly independent of the penultimate Vau, supposed to have been vocalized.

Page 251, line 8.—דְּאִי אֲבִסִין. See the remark above on page 241, line 15.

Page 277, line 28.—"For as Mínos, etc." The expressions of Pláton might seem to imply, that he was cognizant of the true import of this name, for he defines Law to be the Invention of Truth, and attributes its origin (*αἰτίαν*) to the Deity.‡ That such was not the case, however, is clear from his details relative to Mínos, which proves that he regarded him as having really existed, conformably to the legends of his country, which connected his memory with the myth of the Minótauros, and aspersed it accordingly in no measured degree.§

A fate somewhat similar appears to me to have attended the aboriginal founders of the Kretan civilization, the Priests of Kybéle. It is remarkable, that the very region in which these have been located by the Hellenic writers,||

* Vol. III. p. 203., folio edit.

† It is to be remarked here, that BOCHART sets out with the Feminine form הַשְׁבִּיעַת, appearing to forget that אִי, "insula," to which it refers, is a masculine noun. It may be, however, that he designed its immediate reference to עִיר, "urbs."

The advantage of selecting the Aramaic form שְׁבַעַת is, that it at once supplies the meaning "septimus," and this independently of its being the more appropriate one on the present occasion in a dialectal sense.

‡ Cp. Mínos, p. 315. a. De Legibus, p. 624. a.

§ Mínos, p. 318. a.

|| Diódor. v. 64.

is that of the Ἀπτεραῖοι, that is, if we are to allow any weight to homophony, of the כַּפְתָּרִים,* as also that the arts which they are said to have introduced amongst the rude tribes of Kréte† were those in which the ancient Egyptians are known to have excelled. Their identification by Pausanías,‡ moreover, with the Kurêtes, whom Diódoros§ classes separately, is worthy of attention, inasmuch as it suggests an inquiry how it came to pass, that names so dissimilar as Δάκτυλοι and Κουρήτες had been attributed to one and the same community. The following solution of this difficulty may perhaps attract consideration.

I would assign to the first of these an Egyptian origin; to the second a Phœnikian, or Shemitic. I conceive Δάκτυλοι to have been due to the depreciating spirit which characterized the Greek when dealing with the myths of Barbarians whom he stigmatized as (γόητας) Jugglers or Sorcerers,|| influenced by which, he would translate the title ῥωαε ἱελεπιπ, “homines cordati,” as though the last of these words were ἱελοπιπ, “digiti,” that is, δακτύλου (ώτίτου). We thus perceive how a paronomastic version may have supplanted the correct and eulogistic one, and obtain an insight into the meaning of Δάκτυλοι, which appeared so enigmatical to the Hellenic writers themselves.**

As to the Ethnic Κουρήτες, I regard it as the Greek form of כּוּרְתִים, in the same way that Ἀβαντες was of אַבְסִים,†† and as radically identical with Κρήτες, כְּרִתִים.

GENERAL POSTSCRIPT.

Page 117, line 11.—The reader will perceive that the instance here referred to is that of the phylé Demetriás, one of the two which were added to the ancient ones of Kleisthénés, in the decline of the Athenian republic.‡‡ It

* Supra, p. 276. note (*) fin.

† Diódor. v. 64. s.

‡ v. 7. 4.

§ Ubi supra, c. 65.

|| Diódor. ubi supra.

** Comp. Strab. x. 3. fin. Diódor. Pausan. ubi supra. The alternative which I have adopted of travelling beyond the Hellenic in this emergency is abundantly sanctioned by Strabo's words: Ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλως μυθεύουσιν, ἀπόροις ἅπορα συνάπτοντες.

†† Supra, pp. 250. s.

‡‡ Vide Plútarch. Demétr. xi. fin. Καὶ ταῖς φυλαῖς δύοπροσέθεσαν, Δημητριάδα καὶ Ἀντιγονίδου· καὶ τὴν Βουλὴν τῶν πεντακοσίων πρῶτον, ἑξακοσίων ἐποίησαν. This addition was made in honour

was scarcely necessary, however, that I should have noted it as an exceptional case, as the denomination, like that of Antigonís, was but transient, being speedily replaced with that of Attalís.

Page 118, line 6.—"And always that of his Δῆμος," that is, as expressed by its Ethnical appellation. Thus Σφήττιος, which appears at the close of the titulus cited from FABRETTI,* means a citizen of the dêmos Sphettós, subordinated to the phylé Akamantís.

Page 119.—The statements in this page, lines 8 and 25, have been somewhat too absolutely expressed, as the use of the Demotic ethnic in such a case would be contingent on the political relations subsisting between Athens and the place in which its citizen might happen to be sojourning. If it were a foreign state independent on Athens, his natural designation would be Ἀθηναῖος, to which, though not born in the capital, he would be entitled through his Phylé; but if the contrary, he would describe himself, as at home, by his Dêmos.† It is evident, however, that this qualification of my statements adds to the force of my argument against the Ethnical meaning of Ἀττικός in the inscription.

Page 141. note ().*—The period which contains this passage from Hippokrátēs proceeds as follows: Ἐν δὲ τῇ Εὐρώπῃ ἔστιν ἔθνος Σκυθικόν, ὃ περι τὴν λίμνην οἰκεῖ τὴν Μαιῶτιν διαφέρον τῶν ἐθνέων τῶν ἄλλων, Σαυρομάται καλεῦνται. Τουτέων αἱ γυναῖκες κ. τ. ἐξ. Καὶ μάχονται τοῖς πολεμίοις ἕως ἂν παρθένοι ἐῶσιν. οὐκ ἀποπαρθενέονται δὲ μέχρις ἂν τῶν πολεμίων τρεῖς ἀποκτείνωσι. καὶ οὐ πρότερον συνοικέουσιν ἢ περ τὰ ἱερὰ θύουσαι τῷ ἐν νόμῳ.‡

Page 195, line 30.—"Appears rival, etc." Add to these myths that of the Kilikian Ámanos noticed by Stéphanos: Ἱστοροῦσι, τὸν Ὀρέστην ἀπὸ Ταύρων σὺν Ἰφιγενείᾳ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν κομίσαντα τῆς μανίας λῦσιν εὐρεῖν.§

Page 200, note ().*—This myth of the Naxians has been noticed by Diódoros as follows: Μυθολογοῦσι δὲ Νάξιοι περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου, φάσκοντες παρ' αὐτοῖς

of Demétrios Poliorketés, the liberator of the Athenians, and his father: but their grateful sense of the benefit expired with the prosperity of the benefactor; for, as Stéphanos informs us, ὕστερον (μετωνόμασαν) Ἀτταλίδᾳ καὶ Πτολεμαῖδᾳ, διὰ τῶν ἐπωνύμων εὐεργετηθέντες βασιλέων. P. 218. Ed. Berkel. Compare under ΑΓΝΟΥΣ, p. 24., and ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΕΙΣ, p. 149.

* Supra, p. 188.

† See Böckh's notes in his Corp. Inscr. Tom. II. nn. 2151. 2156. 2227.

‡ Vide Sect. III. p. 291. Ed. Genev. 1657.

§ De Urb. pp. 112. s.

τραφήναι τὸν θεὸν (sc. Διόνυσον), καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν νῆσον αὐτῷ γεγονέναι προσφιλεστάτην, καὶ ὑπὸ τινων Διονυσιάδα καλεῖσθαι. τὸν γὰρ Δία, κατὰ τὸν παραδεδομένον μῦθον, τότε κεραυνωθείσης Σεμέλης πρὸ τοῦ τεκεῖν, τὸ βρέφος λαβόντα, καὶ ἐρράψαντα εἰς τὸν μηρὸν, ὡς ὁ τέλειος τῆς γενέσεως χρόνος ἦλθε, βουλόμενον λαθεῖν τὴν Ἥραν, ἐξελεῖν τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ νῦν Νάξῳ, καὶ δοῦναι τρέφειν ταῖς ἐγγυαρίοις νύμφαις Φιλίᾳ καὶ Κορωνίδι καὶ Κλεΐδῃ.*

Page 202, line 11.—Εἰναλίοις. Compare the following passage from Pindaros: Φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιὰ Ῥήσιες, οὐπω, ὅτε Χθόνα δατέοντο ζεὺς τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι Φανεράν ἐν πελάγει Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίῳ. Ἀλμυροῖς δ' ἐν βένθεσιν νᾶσον κεκρύφθαι.†

Page 203, note (§).—After "Dionýs. Perieget." add v. 212.

TRANSACTIONS, Vol. XXI. Part I. pp. 21. s.

I have concluded the present to be as appropriate an occasion as I could select to lay before the Academy a few observations on another Ionian record namely, the Teïan fragment, a discussion of which occupies some space in the last of my Memoirs that has appeared amongst our Transactions.‡ I have stated in the Postscript which has been appended to it, that certain investigations, subsequent to the time at which it had been read in the hearing of the Academy, induced me to cancel the supplements I had proposed in my version§ of the fragment as then restored; and I concluded my notices respecting it, which at that time could only be general, with expressing a hope of being permitted, at some future period, to submit a more satisfactory statement of the result of the researches connected with it in which I was then engaged.|| That opportunity has now arrived, and I hasten to devote it to the performance of my promise.

The fragment in question has proved to be one of a very remarkable character: nothing less, in all probability, than the missing reply of the Polyrrhœnians of Krête to the application of the Senate and People of the Teïans on the subject of the sacrosanct prerogatives of their city, soil, and peculiar cult. I term it "missing," as, in the collection of documents relating to these claims of

* B. H. v. 52. init.

‡ Vol. XXI. P. I. pp. 11. ss.

† Olymp. vii. 100. ss. Cp. supra, p. 271. note (§).

§ Ibid. pp. 21. s.

|| Ibid. p. 80.

Téos, which was first given to the public by EDMOND CHISHULL,* from the papers of SHERARD and LISLE, all that we find of it are two lines, and fragments of two more. The collection to which I allude comprises the decrees of the following peoples: the Romans, the Aitolians, and various communities of Kréte, namely, the Eleuthernaian, the Istronian, the Sybritian, the Faxian, the Rhaukian, the Arkadian, the Knosian, the Polyrrhenian, the Kydonian, the Lappaian, the Priansian, and the Latian. Amongst these, but very short fragments appear of the Polyrrhenian, Kydonian, Lappaian, and Priansian psephisms in CHISHULL's collection, and that of his editor BÖCKH: but now, unless I am greatly mistaken, we may be said to possess the first of these in its integrity, and nearly the whole of the second.

I am at present concerned more particularly with the Polyrrhenian. We know already from CHISHULL's fragment of it,† that the names of the ambassadors whom the Teïans had sent to Polyrrhénion were Apollódotos and Kolótas, and it happens that these are the very names which we find distinctly mentioned in our fragment. We observe, also, clear indications therein of an order to have the psephism engraved, and deposited in the temple of the Delphian Apóllon, a clause which no other titulus of this kind yet published contains: and, in addition to all this, we find the Polyrrhenians, at the close, mentioned in express terms as acknowledging the consanguinity of one of the Teïan ambassadors, most probably Kolótas, with their community. This, however, is not all. I have found, on examination, that no single psephism which has been hitherto published supplies the integral restoration of this fragment, but that it is necessary to combine the extant tituli of five distinct cities, the Istronian,‡ the Sybritian,§ the Arkadian,|| the Polyrrhenian, and the Latian,** to accomplish this end. The following is the order in which I have made these available: I commenced with the fragment of the Polyrrhenian in CHISHULL, which gave me four lines: I then passed to the Latian, three lines of which brought me on to the seventh: the Istronian and Sybritian jointly completed seven

* *Antiquitates Asiaticæ*, pp. 102–122. Comp. Böckh. Corp. Inscrip. vol. II. pp. 631–643. nn. 3045–3058.

† Ubi supr. p. 121. Böckh. ubi supr. p. 642. n. 3054.

‡ Chishull, p. 110. Böckh, n. 3048.

§ Chishull, p. 113. Böckh. n. 3049.

|| Chishull, p. 118. Böckh, n. 3052.

** Chishull, p. 122. Böckh. n. 3058.

lines more, and part of an eighth, thus carrying me on to the fifteenth line, to perfect which, and make out the sixteenth, I again had recourse to the Latian. The restoration of two additional lines was then effected by means of the Istronian and the Arkadian. Finally, the fragment itself, and it alone, was adequate to the reproduction of the last three lines, with which the psephism terminated.

It thus appears, that a variety of published psephisms is requisite to a satisfactory restoration of the technical language of this mutilated document; as also, that it contains elements which are foreign to all of them. It follows from this, that it could only have been a portion of some one of those Kretan psephisms of which, as already stated, we possess a few of the initial lines in CHISHULL's work; and the fortunate preservation of ΠΟ . . PPHNΙΩΝ in its concluding line necessarily limits our option to the first of these, which I have employed the first also in my process of restoration. I esteem myself, therefore, entitled to the recognition of the learned, as having been the first to reproduce this ancient record in an un mutilated form.

Such of my readers as desire to inspect the fragment in the original, together with my restorations thereof in a continuous series, will find both in my published collection of Teïan inscriptions.* The rules of our Society forbid my giving them a place here; I therefore content myself with subjoining a translation of the minuscule Greek, with which I wish the conjectural version submitted on a former occasion to the Academy,† to be replaced.

“ The Kósmoi and City of the Polyrrenians to the People and Senate
Of the Teïans, greeting. Having received the Decree passed by you, with which
You intrusted your ambassadors, Apollódotos and Kolótas, to bear to us,
We grant both the sacred attribution, which you desire, to Diónysos,

- 5 And to your territory its prerogative of being accounted holy and inviolate:
And to all which remain appertaining to you we shall unite in guaranteeing
Their due consideration and respect, without evasion, or pretext to the contrary,
To the utmost of our ability: and should any of the Polyrrenians act with injustice

* Vide Fascic. II. pp. 127. s. n. CLIV. a. The reader is referred also to pp. 133. s. n. CLVI. c., which I conceive to be the missing Kydonian psephism, relative to the same subject. Of this only one line had appeared before. Vide Chishull, p. 122. Böckh, p. 642. n. 3055.

† “ Transactions” ubi supra, pp. 21. s.

- Towards any one of the Teians, or of any sojourners in Téos, in either a public
- 10 Or a private capacity, in contravention of the Decree passed in relation to
Its inviolability by the City of the Polyrrenians, let it be allowable
To any individual amongst the Teians, or of the sojourners in Téos, to come hither
And make seizure of whatever he may have carried off, whether persons or effects;
And let the Kósmoi who may then be in authority compel the holders thereof
- 15 To make restitution of the same, without incurring any liability for so doing
To penalty or legal process. We will that the Registrars of the City cause this
Decree to be engraven, and lodged in the Temple of the Delphian Apóllon:
Moreover, that hospitable entertainment be given, as provided by the laws,
To the Embassadors: as also, that Apollódotos, son of Astýanax, and Kolótas,
- 20 Son of Hekatónymos, who in his own person is connected also by descent
With the City of the Polyrrenians, be accounted its Proxenic representatives."*

* Προξένος. Public officers appointed by one state within the territories of another, towards which it stood in relations of amity, to receive and befriend such of its citizens as had occasion to visit the latter. They corresponded, but in an honorary sense, to our modern "Consuls." Vide Heródot. VI. 57., VII. 136. 143., and Valckenār's note on the first of these passages.

CORRIGENDA ET ADDENDA.

Page 97. line 1., *after τοῦτο read or, ταύτην τὴν στήλην.*—Ibid. 6., *for synonym read synonyme.* So also in pages 172. 22., 196. 22., 198. 19., 203. 25.—Page 118. line 2., *for Here read Hence.*—119. 13., *for Gentilitial read Ethnical.*—124. 2., *for between read before.*—134. 23., *for goddess read goddesses.*—141. note (*), *for ær read aer.*—146. 18., *for the read their.*—157. note (†), line 4., *for her read the latter's.*—178. 19., *for observations read observation.*—189. 5., *for they read it.*—194. 9., *for marbles read marble.*—201. 1., *for Νῆσος read Νῆσος.*—207. 13., *for οἶον read οἶον.*—208. 28., *for Κῆτα read Κᾶτα.*—224. 27., *dele τοῦ.* So also in 225. 3.—225. 1., *for ἡμῶν read ἡμῶν.*—233. 3., *after expression insert with that.*—237. 33., *for Ardea read Ardeo.*—243. 2., *for ὕλη read ὕλη.*—273. 15., *for combine read unite.*—277. 16., *for Ísis read Netpe.*—243. 17. s., *add the following foot-note:*

The hypothesis here ventured naturally induces the inquiry, how far it is consistent with the geographical name Amathûs, and this I have left open to the consideration of the Koptic student, as being a process which involves no great difficulty. For, assuming the settlement to have been primarily a ΠΛΗΚΕ ("sacred to Ísis"), that is, Thebaice, ΔΕΛΔΩΤΕΨΗΚΕ = ΔΕΛΔΩΤΗΚΕ ("Strength, or Possession, of Ísis"), it is obvious that the law of Hellenic euphony would convert the first member of this compound into αμαθ, by a transposition of the aspirate and the fol-

lowing tenuis, so as to become $\text{ⲧⲉ} = \theta$ (Peyron, Gramm. Copt. pp. 18. 30.), and that of composition would subjoin the discrete o , thus replacing Ⲡⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲧⲉ or Ⲡⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲧ with ⲁⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩ . We may then suppose the Genitive prefix to be retained, $\text{ⲁⲙ} = \text{ev}$, and we obtain $\text{ⲁⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲟⲩⲉⲛ} = \text{ⲁⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲛⲛ}$, by affixing to which the medial of HCE , which is also a case-sign of the imparisyllabic declension, we arrive at ⲁⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲛⲛⲥ : or we may conceive it to have been rejected; in which case the interposed o would combine with the H (ϵ in the earlier Greek) so as to form ov , and thus conduct us to ⲁⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲥ . The retention, however, of the prefix possesses the advantage of leading us to the more archaic form, the analogy of which is proved by the oblique cases of ⲁⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲥ , viz., ⲁⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲛⲧⲟⲥ , etc.

The intelligent reader will thus perceive, that the combination of the Thebaic form, Ⲡⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲧⲉ , possesses this advantage over that of the Memphitic adopted in page 282., that it applies equally well, whether we suppose the cult of Athór to have been primarily introduced, or assume that it had supplanted the Isiac worship; the only difference consisting in this, that, in the first of these cases, the elimination of the aspirate from the leading member of the compound is necessary in order to our obtaining the desired result, namely, ⲁⲙⲁⲑⲟⲩⲥ . That this, however, is as much in accordance with the laws of euphony as the above-mentioned transposition of ⲉⲧ , so as to form θ , cannot but be obvious to any scholar who investigates the process for himself.

A few words, in conclusion, on the subject of the étymon which I have conjectured at the close of this section to have been adopted, or, very probably, feigned, in the instance of Amathús, and which may be viewed in connexion with that intimated above (p. 287.), as the ground of the appellation Dáktyloi , attributed by the Greeks to the priests of Rhéa, their representative of Netpe. I have termed these étyma "paronomastic;" but whether they resulted from ignorance of the true themes, or a desire to appropriate the course of social progress to the Hellenic name, or, when this was out of the question, to deal with the titles of its earlier originators in a depreciating spirit,—it is difficult now to decide. This much, however, is certain, that it is hardly possible to overlook the exact correspondence of the results—the denominations Δάκτυλοι and Σφῆκες —with the sentiments respecting them entertained by the Greeks.

Of this spirit there existed several phases which it is not difficult to detect. One exhibited itself in the adoption of true versions, of which Ⲭⲁⲛⲑⲟⲥ replacing Ⲡⲓⲣⲃⲁ (p. 204.), and ⲕⲁⲗⲛⲉⲛⲁ representing ⲧⲉⲛⲉⲃⲟⲥ (p. 248.), have been adduced as specimens. Another had its expression in the invention of apocryphal themes, such as ⲧⲉⲛⲛⲟⲥ for the same ⲧⲉⲛⲉⲃⲟⲥ (p. 248.), and ⲕⲁⲛⲱⲃⲟⲥ , the name of Menélaos' helmsman (Strabo, xvii. 1.), for the emporium so called (= ⲕⲁⲗⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ , Fascic. Inscr. iii. Ind. Copt., p. 401.), which the Koptic student resolves at once into its true elements, ⲕⲁⲗⲉ , "terra," ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ , "aurum," an appropriate designation of a rich and flourishing sea-port. A third evidenced itself in the transformation of the Barbaric nomenclature into the Hellenic, as in the instances of Lémnos (p. 247.), Lésbos (p. 248.), etc.; and this was found occasionally to preserve the leading idea of the original; for example, ⲉϥⲃⲟⲩⲥ , ⲉϥⲃⲟⲩⲁ (p. 251). Lastly, the transition from these to the invention of Paronomastic themes presents us with a fourth, and at the same time with some curious instances of either strange misconception or perverted ingenuity. In either case, the lesson which it conveys is instructive to the ethnologist.

THE Engravings in front of this page represent the Anaglyphs, the consideration of which and their accompanying inscriptions has occupied the first three sections of the preceding Memoir, in the condition in which they appear at present. The linear dimensions of the respective marbles are as follow :

No. I.

A Clypeate Bust of Claudia Lysimáche, presented by Thelymítres.
pp. 87.-107., 166.-189.

Exterior, or Rectangular Stéle, $2' 7\frac{3}{8}''$ by $2' 5\frac{5}{8}''$.
Interior, or Circular do., $2' 1\frac{3}{8}''$.
Exterior Height of the Moulding of do., $4\frac{1}{8}''$.
Interior do. of do. of do., $3''$.
Length of the Epigraph, $2' 4\frac{1}{2}''$.
Height of the Letters, $1\frac{7}{8}''$.
Depression of the Exterior Stéle below the Moulding, $4\frac{5}{8}''$.

No. II.

A Clypeate Bust of "The New, or Young, Héra" (Fulvia Plautilla), presented to the Ionian Neápolis by Attikós. pp. 107.-189.

Exterior, or Rectangular Stéle, $2' 11\frac{1}{2}''$ by $2' 10\frac{1}{2}''$.
Interior, or Circular do. $2' 4''$.
Exterior Height of the Moulding of do., $3\frac{5}{8}''$.
Interior do. of do. of do., $4''$.
Length of the fragment of the Epigraph extant, $1' 3\frac{1}{8}''$.
Height of the Letters, $2''$.
Depression of the Exterior Stéle below the Moulding, $4\frac{1}{8}''$.

The Engravings have been executed on a scale of one-tenth of the original.

